

bulletin





The Department of State bulletin

VOL. XXV, No. 631 • PUBLICATION 4310

July 30, 1951

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication compiled and edited in the Division of Publications, Office of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes press releases on foreign policy issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, as well as legislative material in the field of international relations, are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U. S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D. C.

Price:
52 issues, domestic \$7.50, foreign \$10.25
Single copy, 20 cents

The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (July 29, 1949).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

Unity of Western Europe—Essential for World Security

By General Dwight D. Eisenhower
*Supreme Allied Commander, Europe*¹

One hundred seventy-five years ago, the founding fathers of the American Republic declared their independence of the British Crown. Little could they have known—in the heat and bitterness of the hour—that the severance, accomplished in passion, would through the years flower into an alliance of such fitness and worth that it was never recorded on legal parchment, but in the hearts of our two peoples. The bond that joins us—stronger than blood lines, than common tongue and common law—is the fundamental conviction that man was created to be free, that he can be trusted with freedom, that governments have as a primary function the protection of his freedom.

In the scale of values of the English-speaking people, freedom is the first and most precious right. Without it, no other right can be exercised, and human existence loses all significance. This unity of ours in fundamentals is an international fact. Yet on more than one occasion, it has been obscured in Britain and in my own country by concern with trifles and small disputes, fanned into the flames of senseless antagonisms.

Serious differences in conviction must be beaten out on the anvil of logic and justice. But scarcely need they be dragged into the public forum, in the petty hope of capturing a fleeting local acclaim, at the expense of an absent partner! There are men in this room with whom, in World War II, I had arguments, hotly sustained and of long duration. Had all these been headlined in the press of our two countries, they could have created public bitterness, confusing our peoples in the midst of our joint effort. Decisions were reached without such calamitous results, because those at odds did not find it necessary to seek justification for their personal views in a public hue and cry. Incidentally, a more personal reason for this expression of satisfaction is a later conclusion that my own posi-

tion in the arguments was not always right. In any case, may we never forget that our common devotion to deep human values and our mutual trust are the bedrock of our joint strength.

In that spirit our countries are joined with the peoples of Western Europe and the North Atlantic to defend the freedoms of Western civilization. Opposed to us—cold and forbidding—is an ideological front that marshals every weapon in the arsenal of dictatorship. Subversion, propaganda, deceit, and the threat of naked force are daily hurled against us and our friends in a globe-encircling, relentless campaign.

We earnestly hope that the call for a truce in Korea marks a change in attitude. If such a welcome development does occur, the brave men of the United Nations forces did much to bring it about. We entered the conflict one year ago, resolved that aggression against free and friendly South Korea would not be tolerated. Certain of the nations furnishing forces had heavy demands elsewhere, including postwar reconstruction at home. Nevertheless, every contingent added evidence of the solidarity and firmness of the free nations in giving an object lesson to aggression. Our success in this difficult and distant operation reflects the fortitude of the Allied troops and the leadership that guided them.

Realism and Might Against Communism

The stand in Korea should serve notice in this area, as well as in the Far East, that we will resist aggression with all the force at our command. Our effort to provide security against the possibility of another and even greater emergency—an emergency which will never be of our making—must go forward with the same resolution and courage that has characterized our Korean forces. The member nations in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) need not fear the future or any Communistic threat if we are alert, realistic,

¹ Notes for address made before the English Speaking Union at London on July 3 and released to the press by SHAPE on the same date.

and resolute. Our community possesses a potential might that far surpasses the sinister forces of slave camps and chained millions. But to achieve the serenity and the confidence that our potential can provide, we must press forward with the mobilization of our spiritual and intellectual strength; we must develop promptly the material force that will assure the safety of our friends upon the continent and the security of the free world.

This is the challenge of our times that, until satisfactorily met, establishes priorities in all our thoughts, our work, our sacrifices. The hand of the aggressor is stayed by strength—and strength alone!

Although the security of each of us is bound up in the safety of all of us, the immediate threat is most keenly felt by our partners in Europe. Half the continent is already within the monolithic mass of totalitarianism. The drawn and haunted faces in the docks of the purge courts are grim evidence of what Communistic domination means. It is clearly necessary that we quickly develop maximum strength within free Europe itself. Our own interests demand it.

It is a truism that where, among partners, strength is demanded in its fullness, unity is the first requisite. Without unity, the effort becomes less powerful in application, less decisive in result. This fact has special application in Europe. It would be difficult indeed to overstate the benefits, in these years of stress and tension, that would accrue to NATO if the free nations of Europe were truly a unit.

But in that vital region, history, custom, language, and prejudice have combined to hamper integration. Progress has been and is hobbled by a web of customs barriers interlaced with bilateral agreements, multilateral cartels, local shortages, and economic monstrosities. How tragic! Free men, facing the spectre of political bondage, are crippled by artificial bonds that they themselves have forged, and they alone can loosen! Here is a task to challenge the efforts of the wisest statesmen, the best economists, the most brilliant diplomats.

European leaders, seeking a sound and wise solution, are spurred by the vision of a man at this table—a man of inspiring courage in dark hours, of wise counsel in grave decisions. Winston Churchill's plea for a united Europe can yet bear such greatness of fruit that it may well be remembered as the most notable achievement of a career marked by achievement.

The difficulties of integrating Western Europe of course appear staggering to those who live by ritual. But great majorities in Europe earnestly want liberty, peace, and the opportunity to pass on to their children the fair lands and the culture of Western Europe. They deserve, at the very least, a fair chance to work together for the com-

mon purpose, freed of the costly encumbrances they are now compelled to carry.

Europe cannot attain the towering material stature possible to its peoples' skills and spirit so long as it is divided by patchwork territorial fences. They foster localized instead of common interest. They pyramid every cost with middlemen, tariffs, taxes, and overheads. Barred, absolutely, are the efficient division of labor and resources and the easy flow of trade. In the political field, these barriers promote distrust and suspicion. They serve vested interests at the expense of peoples and prevent truly concerted action for Europe's own and obvious good.

This is not to say that, as a Commander, I have found anything but ready cooperation among the Governments of Western Europe. Time and again, I have saluted from my heart the spirit of their armed services—of officers and men alike—from the mountains of Italy to the fjords of Norway, from Normandy to the Curtain. Within political circles, I have found statesmen eager to assure the success of their current defense programs. I have no doubts as to the capacity of NATO to surmount even the formidable obstacles imposed upon us by the political facts of present day Europe. Yet with the handicaps of enforced division, it is clear that even the minimum essential security effort will seriously strain the resources of Europe. We ignore this danger at our peril since the effects of economic failure would be disastrous upon spiritual and material strength alike. True security never rests upon the shoulders of men denied a decent present and the hope of a better future.

Security in Achievement of Unity

But with unity achieved, Europe could build adequate security and, at the same time, continue the march of human betterment that has characterized Western civilization. Once united, the farms and factories of France and Belgium, the foundries of Germany, the rich farmlands of Holland and Denmark, the skilled labor of Italy, will produce miracles for the common good. In such unity is a secure future for these peoples. It would mean early independence of aid from America and other Atlantic countries. The coffers, mines, and factories of that continent are not inexhaustible. Dependence upon them must be minimized by the maximum in cooperative effort. The establishment of a workable European federation would go far to create confidence among people everywhere that Europe was doing its full and vital share in giving this cooperation.

Any soldier contemplating this problem would be moved to express an opinion that it cannot be attacked successfully by slow infiltration, but only by direct and decisive assault, with all available means.

The project faces the deadly danger of procrastination, timid measures, slow steps and cautious stages. Granted that the bars of tradition and habit are numerous and stout, the greatest bars to this, as to any human enterprise, lie in the minds of men themselves. The negative is always the easy side, since it holds that nothing should be done. The negative is happy in lethargy, contemplating, almost with complacent satisfaction, the difficulties of any other course. But difficulties are often of such slight substance that they fade into nothing at the first sign of success. If obstacles are of greater consequence, they can always be overcome when they *must* be overcome. And which of these obstacles could be so important as peace, security, and prosperity for Europe's populations? Could we not help? We, the peoples of the British Commonwealth and of the United States, have profited by unity at home. If, with our moral and material assistance, the free European nations could attain a similar integration, our friends would be strengthened, our own economies improved, and the laborious NATO machinery of mutual defense vastly simplified.

A solid, healthy, confident Europe would be the greatest possible boon to the functioning and objectives of the Atlantic Pact.

But granting that we cannot reach maximum security without a united Europe, let us by no means neglect what is within our immediate grasp or deprecate the achievements already attained.

From Figures to Reality

Look back, I ask you, over a space of 2 years only. Consider the dangerous level to which morale and defensive strength had descended: the despairing counsel of neutralism, appeasement, and defeatism that then existed. Against such a backdrop, the accomplishments of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization are magnificently manifest. We are joined together in purpose and growing determination; we know the danger, we have defined our goals. Each day we make headway. The basic economies of European nations are on the upswing: the chaos and floundering of the postwar years are definitely behind. The international forces of Atlantic defense are no longer merely figures on paper; the international organization is no longer a headquarters without troops. The forces—ground, naval, and air—are assembling. They are training together and the spirit of mutual respect and cooperation that marks their joint maneuvers is heartening and encouraging. Still far too few in numbers and short of equipment, their ranks are filling; machines and weapons reach them in a steady stream. The military and political leaders of the participating nations no longer slowly feel their

way forward in an endeavor without guiding precedent. Caution that is inescapable in a new and unique enterprise has been replaced by confidence born out of obstacles overcome. The Allied Powers in Europe are constituting a team for defense, one capable of assuring a lasting and secure peace.

The winning of freedom is not to be compared to the winning of a game—with the victory recorded forever in history. Freedom has its life in the heart, the actions, the spirit of men, and so it must be daily earned and refreshed—else like a flower cut from its life-giving roots, it will wither and die.

All of us have pledged our word, one to the other, that this shall not be. We have cut the pattern for our effort—we are devoting to it available resources for its realization. We fight not only our own battle—we are defending for all mankind those things that allow personal dignity to the least of us—those things that permit each to believe himself important in the eyes of God. We are preserving opportunity for men to lift up their hearts and minds to the highest places—there must be no stragglers in such a conflict.

The road ahead may be long—it is certain to be marked by critical and difficult passages. But if we march together, endure together, share together, we shall succeed—we shall *gloriously* succeed together!

U.K. Offers Aid to Flood Victims

[Released to the press July 19]

The following note was delivered to the Department of State today by the British Embassy:

His Majesty's Ambassador for the United Kingdom presents his compliments to the Secretary of State and has the honour to inform him that he has been instructed by His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to inquire whether there is any aid which His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom and the British people can give to those who have been afflicted by the disastrous fires and floods which have recently occurred in the States of Kansas and Missouri. Sir Oliver Franks would be grateful if Mr. Acheson would let him know what suggestions the United States Administration wish him to transmit to His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom.

BRITISH EMBASSY,
WASHINGTON, D. C.
19th July, 1951.

The Department is deeply gratified by this token of friendship by the Government and people of the United Kingdom for those afflicted by fires and floods in Kansas and Missouri. The Department is exploring suggestions which may be made to this generous offer of aid.

Touring the Border¹

By W. J. Caldwell

The sleepy Bavarian hamlet of Moedlareuth typifies the results of the Communist doctrine of divide . . . and utter confusion.

There, as in many other communities lying astride the Iron Curtain which wraps snake-like around miles of Bavaria's twisting northern and eastern frontiers, the demarcation line between East and West lies flush in the center of town.

Citizens of Moedlareuth tell you that having the home town split in two with a forbidden wall to keep lifelong neighbors and friends apart is no joke. One man living on the Bavarian side of town hadn't visited his brother, a resident of the Soviet half of the town, for more than 18 months despite the fact they live only a stone's throw apart. Countless others experience similar family splits. But many, with a sly wink, admit that Russian vigilance has not prevented an occasional "sneak" journey across the border.

"A community of two nations," grunted one leathery-faced native as he leaned on his cane on the Bavarian side of town.

"Yah," sighed a peasant woman as she snatched up an unwary child of three toddling in the direction of the unpainted fence which marked the zonal dividing line, "two nations side by side—but so distant."

Moedlareuth was a typical German farming community situated partly in the county of Hof, in the extreme northeast corner of Bavaria, until that fateful day when the Russians put up the fence in the middle of the village. The half which the Soviets claimed lies in adjacent Thuringia. That original barrier, which follows the course of a small stream which forms the state border, was later made more impenetrable by the Soviets. They dug a trench parallel to the fence and then

added another wooden fence as a triple deterrent to East-West relations. Reinforcement of the Iron Curtain at that point followed swiftly on the heels of two Curtain-defying incidents.

A young Bavarian, on the day of his wedding, wanted to celebrate the nuptial occasion by publicly flaunting the Soviets. He brazenly drove his car across Moedlareuth's main street, smashing the fence to a splintered loop, and then driving triumphantly back through another section of the wavering Curtain to western safety.

The second Iron Curtain-busting incident which prompted the three-layer border barrier involved a trucking company whose owner decided it was healthier to go west. Mobilizing his fleet of trucks and tractors, he convoyed the rumbling exodus across town, through the hapless wooden barrier, to a safe haven on the Bavarian side.

Moedlareuth as a whole comprises approximately 210 natives and some 50 houses, many dating back centuries. The Bavarian side of town was left without a school, a store, a post office and a community well by the Soviet's decision to partition the community. Fortunately, one enterprising woman on the Bavarian side of town had, with true womanly intuition, opened a tiny shop in her home which served bottled beer. Her foresight saved the Bavarian side from a complete drought.

William G. Keen of Chattanooga, Tenn., U.S. resident officer of county Hof, said the Soviet-inspired division had created quite a problem for the hamlet's Bavarian citizens.

"In normal times," 38-year-old Keen drawled, "the kids on the Bavarian side of town merely crossed the road into Thuringia and in a matter of minutes were in school. The school is now barred to them so they have to walk two miles to the nearest Bavarian school at Toepen. There was also the mail problem. At first the Bavarian residents were able to walk to the Soviet border and have their mail handed to them over the fence. But the Russians stopped that, so now mail has to be routed to them from Toepen, the closest Bavarian village having a post office."

¹ This article, reprinted from the June issue of the *Hicoog Information Bulletin*, is an account of a tour of Bavaria's northern and eastern borders, overlooking the Soviet Zone of Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Austria, made in May by 20 press, radio, magazine, and newsreel correspondents. The tour, arranged by the Public Relations Division, Hicoog, enabled them to observe first-hand how people live and work within the shadows of the Iron Curtain.

The likable resident officer said the community's water well posed one of the greatest problems. The more daring Bavarians have sneaked across the border at night for their pail of water. But it's risky. One hapless woman, wife of a Bavarian border policeman, was apprehended by a Soviet Zone so-called "People's Police" as she was kneeling by the forbidden well. Her captors drove her six miles to Soviet headquarters, where she was thoroughly grilled. She later was released but had to walk back. The Bavarian side of town now is building its own well to avoid the risk of more serious consequences befalling its citizens.

It was mid-afternoon when we drove into Moedlareuth and the streets on both sides of the frontier were deserted except for two "People's Police" guarding the Soviet side of the barrier. Our arrival attracted natives from both sides of town. On the Soviet side, a score of men, women and children gathered near the barrier. They waved and exchanged pleasantries, seeming not to mind the two rifle-toting "People's Police." Shortly after we reached the town, the two "People's Police" hurried to a field telephone and minutes later more than a dozen "People's Police" reinforcements arrived from various directions. They clustered in a group 200 feet from where we stood.

A chicken pecked its way across the churned up border and just as nonchalantly returned over the "no-man's" strip. Citizens on the Soviet side watched with envy.

We had been at the border about an hour when a warning whisper was hissed among the Eastern onlookers that "the Russians are coming." Frantic mothers on the eastern side of the border grabbed their offspring and together with their menfolk fled into their houses. Within seconds the Soviet part of Moedlareuth was deserted except for the gaping "People's Police." On the Bavarian side of town, the citizens remained unperturbed. They smiled, joked and seemed to say, "Gosh, ain't freedom wonderful."

A cloud of dust rose from the nearby hill where the Russian soldiers reportedly were on guard. The dust cloud moved rapidly closer and then from it emerged a battered German-army "jeep" of World War II vintage. The lumbering vehicle, manned by two uniformed "People's Police," rumbled over the dirt road toward us and then about 25 feet away it followed the road which runs parallel to the zonal boundary. The vehicle skidded to a stop by the group of "People's Police," but nothing more happened. The border guards continued to stare at us until we finally departed.²

Moedlareuth is just one of many towns straddling the zonal border which have been halved by

the Soviets' zonal policy. At towns lying partly in Bavaria and partly in Czechoslovakia, Communist officials have created a barren no-man's buffer corridor by demolishing houses on their side of the frontier. The unfortunate occupants were obliged to find shelter elsewhere.

Resident Officer Keen pointed to border police statistics to show how ineffective the Communist zonal policy is. The illegal border traffic is one-sided all along the Iron Curtain frontier, with many times more Easterners seeking to enter the western zones of Germany.

"The Easterners," the resident officer pointed out, "risk death, slave labor or other primitive forms of punishment to escape to the West. Many of them bring stories which would make your hair curl. Still others, with families in the East whom they don't dare desert through fear of Soviet reprisals, slip across the border merely to visit relatives and friends, to get a square meal or to purchase other necessities of life unavailable or beyond reach of their pocketbooks in the Soviet Zone."

Mr. Keen was quick to admit that the people living in the Hof area, as in other border counties, have their problems—mainly housing, unemployment, a steady influx of refugees, the flight of industry westward, the acquirement of needed raw materials for the border area's manifold industries, and new markets for the finished goods.

"Being human," he said, "many of the citizens complain—some probably too much. But on the whole the people seem thankful they are free and have been given the opportunity, mainly through American financial aid, to better their living conditions. The Marshall Plan was a big factor in restoring self-confidence. It helped show them democracy is not just talk, but cooperative action."

While many Bavarians complain of the drain on their economy from the refugees, some are well aware of the contributions these refugees have made in bringing new industries to their area. The Neuerer porcelain factory in Hof is a good example. This world-famous concern, one of many border factories visited by the correspondents, formerly was located in Czechoslovakia. It moved west and in addition to providing employment for hundreds of Hof workers, it is now earning much-needed dollars for the West German economy by exporting the bulk of its products to the United States.

The correspondents visited three Bavarian border areas—Hof, Coburg and Passau—and in each there was one postwar problem most frequently voiced. Creation of the Iron Curtain along the border had caused a major trade dislocation, since in normal times the bulk of commercial relations these areas had were with the East. Coal and other raw materials had been obtained cheaply from nearby Czechoslovakia and other countries now behind the Iron Curtain. And the finished products formerly were marketed in the East.

²Ten minutes after the correspondents departed, a detail of approximately 50 armed Russian soldiers arrived at the border town but there was no incident.

Today, except for authorized crossing-points, roads and railroad lines connecting Bavaria with her eastern markets have been blocked off at the border. Consequently, manufacturers have had to turn west—getting coal from the more distant Ruhr and seeking markets in far-off western European countries and the United States.

Hans Peter Thomsen of Madison, Wis., resident officer in the counties of Coburg and Neustadt since last August, said this problem is especially acute in Coburg, which jets peninsula-like into the Soviet Zone. The county is rimmed by the Iron Curtain on the west, north and east, forcing traffic to follow a 90-degree route between Coburg and western Europe.

It greatly increases the operating costs of Coburg's manufacturers, making it difficult for the area's businesses, which comprise small industrial enterprises producing mainly toys, ceramics, chinaware, furniture, electric cables and Christmas tree ornaments, and 5,000 small farms, to compete on the world's free markets. This is one reason why unemployment in the Coburg area is higher than the over-all Bavarian average. Generally speaking, the people living on Bavaria's borders facing Communist-dominated lands are trying to make the best of their lot. Roads linking them with the west are being repaired and new ones built, and housing slowly but resolutely is being provided in most areas to accommodate workers seeking employment in old and new industries.

In some border communities, which in prewar days attracted tourists from far and wide, the local officials have been more reluctant about marring their beautiful landscape with smoke and soot-erupting factories. Passau, which faces Austria and where William J. Garlock of Bloomfield, N. J., serves as resident officer, has launched a large power project as an economy aid. However, many of Passau's leading citizens still frown on industries which they fear would deter future tourist trade when life there once more becomes normal.

All along the border, the problem of training youth for democratic living was heard. The Communist-dominated youth movement (FöJ) in the Soviet Zone of Germany, freely financed by the Communist Party, is making a determined effort to convert Bavarian youth to their cause. The highly-regimented FöJers have made surprisingly few inroads on Bavarian youth, however, despite the impetus a movement of their kind normally receives when substandard economic conditions and widespread unemployment exist.

The anti-Communist youth movement in the border areas generally has received less financial support from local government officials, but their unregimented organization has grown—a growth which many observers attribute in part to the proximity of Communism itself. The Bavarian youth, like their elders, don't have to be told about the evils of a Communist state. Stories recounted

by refugees of life under Red rule has been convincing proof for most of the youth that while conditions in their own Bavarian communities may be bad, their life still is a paradise to that in the East.

Hicog, through its resident officers, and U.S. Military authorities are working hand in glove with Bavarian officials to maximize work and play opportunities for Bavarian youth. In Coburg, for instance, a youth home was established in the summer of 1950 through the joint efforts and cooperation of local Bavarian authorities, Hicog and the U.S. Army.

The Hof area, as part of its energetic youth program, has completed plans for an international youth forum and camp on the border—one of many such activities planned this summer to promote greater understanding with other nations and to provide, for the benefit of the East zone, an example of unregimented youth activity.

The U.S. resident officer—the American Government's so-called "grass-roots ambassador"—deserves much of the credit for introducing the western brand of democracy to a people who, geographically, are exposed to Eastern influences.

Only a person who has never taken the trouble to observe the resident officer in action can doubt the vital role he is playing in postwar Germany. His job is a round-the-clock one, with endless conferences, meetings and discussions with local officials and citizenry representing all facets of community life.

Sandwiched into his never-ending schedule of activities are the many problems the resident officer is expected to solve—a controversy stemming from a hunting incident involving a member of the Allied governments stationed in Germany, liaison between American and German officials on a project affecting the interests of both nations, engineering Hicog's exchanges program at the county level, answering questions or providing information in defense of Western democratic concepts and principles. These are just a few of the jobs which daily demand of the resident officer Solomon-like judgment, wisdom, and discretion.

Traditional rivalry between city and county government officials in Coburg—a rivalry which existed long before 1920 when Coburg, the ancestral home of the Dukes of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha, ceased its historic role as a duchy and was incorporated into the Bavarian state—had retarded community cooperation. This condition was further heightened by the fact that the Coburg area politically leans toward two extremes—right and left.

Resident Officer Thomsen sensed this rivalry shortly after he took up his post there. He investigated, analyzed the situation, consulted the more open-minded community leaders, and then took some positive steps. Mr. Thomsen intensified Hicog's educational program by organizing youth forums and discussion groups. In the field of

adult education he induced the adult people's school (*Volkshochschule*) to institute a series of lectures, conducted by elected city and county officials of the area, on local civic affairs, explaining that "this development is significant if you will bear in mind the traditional philosophy of the government official—namely, to govern." Mr. Thomsen said of the lectures: "Slowly but surely, the concept of the public official as a public servant, responsible to the citizens of his community, is taking root."

Mr. Thomsen succeeded in getting the citizens interested in problems pertaining to their particular fields, but bringing them together to tackle problems on a community-wide basis was another thing. Public officials were reluctant to look at the over-all welfare of the community. Coburg city officials, the majority members of the Free Democratic Party (FDP), and Coburg county officials, predominantly Social Democrats (SPD), were at odds for reasons primarily of political dogma.

The resident officer finally solved that problem by hitting upon the community planning council idea.

"Citizens not only have a right to determine by whom they should be governed," Mr. Thomsen argued, "but how their schools and parks should look, how their hospitals and streets should be built. In other words, they have the right to help plan their community."

The attitude of officialdom toward community planning in its earlier stages was succinctly expressed by Coburg's mayor, Dr. Walter Langer, who told Mr. Thomsen: "It is easy for you Americans to plan because you have the dollars." Retorted Mr. Thomsen: "No, Dr. Langer, we have dollars because we have planned."

The resident officer was determined to show political diehards that community-wide planning was not a matter of dollars but common sense. His first success was among the area's educators and scholars, who, at his suggestion, formed a city planning group late in 1950. The group attracted interested citizens from both the city and county, including some government officials who, while they still suspiciously eyed community planning, were sufficiently politically-minded to heed the views of their constituents.

The planning committee grew, and both county and city government heads began taking an active role. However, at the beginning community planning was limited to city or county—never the two jointly.

City and county officials, sitting with local citizens on the planning committee, at first glared at each other. Then they began wrangling. Mr. Thomsen was encouraged when he noticed they were beginning to agree occasionally on minor problems affecting either city or county. The big turning point came early this year when the two rival political camps decided to meet to discuss

problems common to both city and county. That history-making meeting was held late last January when city and county officials, along with government representatives from Munich and Bonn, sat down at one table with an eye on their common community problems.

Mr. Thomsen had reason to be proud of an accomplishment for which he was mainly responsible.

Duplicating the truce declared by city and county officials of Coburg, Bavarian citizens along the border are meeting and solving many of their problems. And in seeking to better their own way of life, they are not turning their back on their less fortunate fellow countrymen who live across the zonal border in the Soviet Zone.

At virtually every village and hamlet we visited we were asked by Bavarians: "Do you realize that the Germans living in the East also are waiting to be liberated by you Americans?"

More than once we were told that "whenever the Americans withdraw their troops from a border point, it causes even greater concern among the eastern Germans than among the Bavarians. The eastern Germans feel safer knowing the American soldiers are nearby."

And many Bavarians relayed this message they said they had received from relatives and friends in the Soviet Zone: "Please remind the Americans that most of us are Communists by force—not of our own free will."

● *W. J. Caldwell is Chief of the Public Relations Branch, Office of Land Commissioner, Bavaria.*

U.S. Concessions to Sweden Under GATT Made Effective

[Released to the press July 5]

The President, in a letter of July 3, 1951, to the Secretary of the Treasury, authorized the application, as of July 7, of certain United States tariff concessions negotiated at the 1950-51 tariff conference at Torquay, England, under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. This action was taken as a result of the signature, by Sweden, on June 7, 1951, of the Torquay Protocol to the General Agreement.¹

Under the Torquay Protocol a country negotiating there may withhold the concessions initially negotiated with another country until the thirtieth day after that country has signed the protocol and made provision for putting into effect its own concessions.

The United States is continuing to withhold practically all the concessions initially negotiated

¹ BULLETIN of June 25, 1951, p. 1020.

with Austria, Brazil, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, Indonesia, Italy, Korea, Norway, Peru, and Turkey, until those countries have signed the Torquay Protocol. In addition to Sweden, six other countries with which the United States negotiated at Torquay—the Benelux Customs Union (Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg), Canada, France, and the Dominican Republic—had previously signed the protocol and United States concessions to those countries were put into effect on June 7.

The President's letter to the Secretary of the Treasury was published in the *Federal Register*.² Copies of schedule XX of the General Agreement, as negotiated at Torquay, are available for inspection at the field and regional offices of the Department of Commerce.

A detailed discussion of the concessions exchanged between the United States and Sweden is contained in the *Preliminary Analysis of the Torquay Protocol of Accession, Schedules, and Related Documents* (State Department pub. 4209) also available by purchase from the Superintendent of Documents (Price \$1.00).

U.S. Begins Conversations on Spain's Role in European Defense

[Released to the press July 18]

At his press conference today, Secretary Acheson made the following statement regarding the July 16 conversation between Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations, and Generalissimo Francisco Franco:

Admiral Sherman's interview with General Franco on Monday has caused widespread speculation in the press, both here and abroad. The facts are as follows:

Military authorities are in general agreement that Spain is of strategic importance to the general defense of Western Europe. As a natural corollary to this generally accepted conclusion, tentative and exploratory conversations have been undertaken with the Spanish Government with the sole purpose of ascertaining what Spain might be willing and able to do which would contribute to the strengthening of the common defense against possible aggression.

We have been talking with the British and French Governments for many months about the possible role of Spain in relation to the general defense of Western Europe. We have not been able to find a common position on this subject with these Governments for reasons of which we

are aware and understand. However, for the strategic reasons outlined above, the United States has initiated these exploratory conversations.

Any understanding which may ultimately be reached will supplement our basic policy of building the defensive strength of the West. It has been and is our firm intention to see to it that if Western Europe is attacked it will be defended—and not liberated. The presence of American armed forces in Western Europe bears witness to this intent as does the appointment, at the request of our NATO Allies, of General Eisenhower as Supreme Commander.

We are sending vast amounts of military and other aid to these Allies for whom a clear priority has been established. There will be no change in this procedure. In other words, the North Atlantic Treaty is fundamental to our policy in Europe and the closest possible cooperation with our NATO Allies will remain the keystone of this policy.

Spain Receives Credits For Purchase of Coal, Wheat

[Released to the press by the Export-Import Bank July 10]

Two new credits to Spain totaling 5.8 million dollars have been granted by the Export-Import Bank, with the approval of the Economic Cooperation Administrator, on the basis of an authorization in title I, chapter XI of the General Appropriations Act of 1951.

The first of the two, in the amount of 3.5 million dollars, is to finance the purchase and shipment of coal from the United States to be used in the Spanish steel industry and coking plants. The second credit, amounting to 2.25 million dollars, is to finance the purchase and shipment of an additional quantity of wheat.

Spain possesses deposits of various types of coal. In recent years, Spanish domestic production of coal has averaged approximately 12 million metric tons a year. But Spain has always been in varying degrees dependent on foreign sources for certain specialized types of coal not produced at all or produced in inadequate amounts in Spain itself. Spain's imported coal requirements vary from 500,000 to 1,000,000 tons a year, depending on the level of economic activity, the availability of other sources of power, and the supply of raw materials to industries using imported coal.

Spain has never before imported coal from the United States but has depended entirely on European sources of supply. However, as a result of shortages and reduction in the exports of European coal producers, Spain finds itself faced with the need to import certain types of high-grade coal from the United States. The imports are

² 16 Fed. Reg. 6607. The schedule is also included in *Treasury Decisions No. 52739*, published by the Treasury Department on June 7 and available by purchase from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. (Price 15 cents).

particularly necessary for the steel and coke industries.

The coal credit of 3.5 million dollars has been established in favor of Central Siderurgica, S. A., which is a private organization established in 1907 representing Spanish steel mills and coke companies. Spanish mills provide the bulk of Spain's requirements in steel, their production in 1950 having reached 807,000 metric tons.

In March 1951 a credit of 5 million dollars was authorized for the purchase of wheat in order to provide for temporary shortages. The additional credit of 2.25 million dollars is designed to assist Spain in covering her most urgent wheat requirements until the coming harvest, when a bumper crop is expected.

Each of the two credits bears interest at 3 percent per annum payable semiannually; the principal to be repaid in 20 years following a period of grace of 5 years; and each credit is to be unconditionally guaranteed by the Spanish Government.

New Soviet Publication Called Part of "Peace Offensive"

At Secretary Acheson's press conference on July 18, a correspondent asked what his reaction was to the new Soviet publication called *News* which had come out and spoken of Anglo-American friendship. Mr. Acheson replied that he thought one had to be completely realistic about things like that that happened in the Soviet Union. He remarked that he would say, in the first place, one had to remember that there was always the Soviet censor. He said that therefore, when something like this was published, one knew it was published for a purpose. He continued that, in the second place, this magazine was published in the English language, that it was not published in Russian. He commented that the readers of English in the Soviet Union were undoubtedly fairly limited. He explained that it looked, therefore, as though this were published for foreign consumption and was to be let through by the censor for that purpose.

The Secretary continued that the next thing one noticed, when one looked at the content of the matter in this journal, was that it was quite contrary to material which was being published in Russia in the Soviet press and to material going out over the Soviet radio.

Mr. Acheson commented that this was obviously a part of the drive—this "peace-offensive" drive—this Russian lullaby which we were having sung to us now for the purpose of getting us to relax our efforts to go forward with the whole program to build strength in the West. He added that he could not imagine a more stupid or a more dangerous thing that this country could do than to be lulled by that sort of thing.

Bavarian Radio To Broadcast On New Frequency

[Released to the press by HICOG July 9]

The Bavarian Radio has been assigned a new broadcasting frequency designed to improve radio reception in southern Bavaria, it was announced today by Shepard Stone, director of the Office of Public Affairs, Hicog.

Beginning July 12, the Bavarian Radio will use the new frequency of 800 kilocycles, Mr. Stone said, employing the transmitter at Ismaning with special directional antenna. Mr. Stone said:

The construction of the directional antenna was intended to give the Bavarian Radio better reception and avoid interference with the Leningrad radio, which broadcasts on the same frequency.

The complicated antenna system was erected by the Bavarian Radio with the assistance of American broadcasting engineers provided by the Department of State. This action was taken in accordance with the policy of the United States Government as a result of the European Broadcasting Convention at Copenhagen in 1948, which failed to make adequate provisions for radio broadcasting in the U.S. area of control in Germany. Although it is unable to carry out the provisions of the Copenhagen plan, the United States Government will continue to maintain all essential broadcasting and will attempt to hold interference to a minimum.

U.S. Sends Condolences On Death of King of Jordan

[Released to the press July 20]

Following is the text of a message sent by President Truman to His Royal Highness Prince Talal of Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan on the occasion of the assassination of King Abdullah July 20:

I have been deeply moved to learn of the sudden and tragic death of your father, King Abdullah. His name will live as one of the great personages in the history of the Arab peoples. I extend to you my deepest and most heartfelt sympathy in this hour of your great loss.

The President sent the following message to His Royal Highness The Emir Naif, Regent of the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan:

I send to Your Royal Highness my condolences and deep sympathy on the tragic death of His Majesty your father, King Abdullah Ibn Hussain. It is deeply to be regretted that Your Royal Highness should be called upon to assume the Regency of the Jordan Kingdom under such unhappy circumstances. I know, however, that the memory of your father's wise statesmanship will long remain a guide and inspiration to Your Royal Highness and the Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan.

The following message was sent by Secretary Acheson to His Excellency Samir Pasha al-Rifai, Prime Minister of Jordan:

I have learned with the deepest regret and sorrow of the news of the tragic death of His Majesty King Abdullah. I wish to express to you and to the Jordanian people the condolences and deepest sympathy of the American people and Government on this sorrowful occasion.

U.S. Rejects Polish Protest in Repatriation Question

TEXT OF POLISH NOTE OF JUNE 13

Following is an unofficial English translation of a note delivered to the American Embassy at Warsaw concerning the Polish repatriation mission in the United States zone of Germany:

The American authorities in Western Germany refused the Polish repatriation mission in Frankfurt on Main, Munich, and Stuttgart further accreditation and the right to stay in the American occupation zones and demanded that they leave the zone by June 15.

This demand was made with complete disregard of the fact that Polish officials are duly accredited to those authorities.

The Polish Government on May 30, 1951, approached the Embassy of the United States in Warsaw requesting the withdrawal of the above-mentioned demand, but the intervention has produced no results. The Government of the United States has furthermore confirmed the decision of the American authorities in Germany.

As is known, the Polish Repatriation Mission performs, on behalf of the Polish Government, functions connected with the repatriation of Polish citizens deported to Germany during the Hitlerite occupation. The rights of Polish authorities to carry out repatriation activities are based on international acts binding also the Government of the United States and in particular on the resolutions of the United Nations organization of February 12, 1946, and of November 17, 1947, as well as on the resolution of the Council of Foreign Minister's of April 23, 1947.

The order denying the Polish repatriation officials the right to stay in the zone means that the American authorities are attempting through illegal methods to render impossible the performance of the repatriation tasks by the Polish authorities by demanding the liquidation of the Polish Repatriation Mission.

The hostile attitude of the American authorities toward the action of repatriating Polish citizens has been known to the Polish Government for a long time. The Polish Government has more than once been forced to intervene officially concerning the violation by those authorities of their own obligations undertaken with regard to

facilitating repatriation. The American authorities have in every possible way been systematically obstructing the repatriation activities of the Polish representatives. They have been supporting and aiding organizations whose clear aim was to counteract such activities. The camps for the Polish displaced persons (so-called DP's) were under pressure which frequently assumed the form of brutal terrorization on the part of those organizations. The camps were the scene of continual agitation against return to Poland and of demoralizing propaganda aiming to recruit candidates for subversive and espionage work against Poland.

While the dissemination of true information about Poland and its reconstruction, information particularly needed by the Polish citizens severed from their fatherland, has been made more and more difficult, the Polish camps have at the same time been inundated with calumnious, provocative, and anti-Polish propaganda. The publications of the Polish mission, furnishing honest information about the country, wrestled with difficulties even if it was a matter of license and paper allocation, while publications openly agitating against repatriation and showing hatred against Poland were obtaining without difficulty the means and right of publication.

This policy of the American authorities and the baiting systematically practiced with the support of the American authorities created an atmosphere of pressure against Polish citizens. Those who wished to return to Poland were more than once forced outright to withdraw their applications for repatriation.

At the same time, the American authorities made it difficult for the Polish representatives to enter not only the displaced persons camps but even those camps where repatriates waiting departure for Poland were assembled.

In spite of repeated interventions by the Polish authorities, the American authorities have done nothing to eliminate this state of affairs. Orders recently issued against the members of the Polish Repatriation Mission are evidence of the fact that the American occupation authorities have decided to pass from the system of obstacles and difficulties to the total liquidation of Polish repatriation or-

gans in the zone in order to cut off the Polish displaced persons from the possibility of returning to Poland. The aim of this move is understandable in the light of the policy of remilitarization of Western Germany, conducted by the American authorities. In the process of remilitarization the displaced persons have been assigned a specific role. The American authorities are using the displaced persons, disoriented and confused by false propaganda, severed from their country and families and left without the possibility of building for themselves a stable existence, as reserve manpower for the so-called guard companies and for the recruitment of "foreigners in Germany" into military formations in accordance with the program announced on March 26, 1951, by the Defense Department of the United States.

Polish citizens who suffered irreparable wrongs from Hitlerism are now on orders of the American authorities to serve anti-Polish plans, plans for the remilitarization of Germany which primarily threaten Poland.

Also the provisions of the law approved on April 13, 1951, which under threat of penal sanctions provides for compulsory military service by foreigner-immigrants in the American Army, sheds proper light on the true aims of the anti-repatriation policy of the American authorities.

The demand that Polish repatriation officers leave the United States zone and that the activities of the Polish Repatriation Mission be terminated is a continuation of the campaign conducted by the American occupational authorities against the Polish representative missions in their zone. This action cannot be considered otherwise than anti-Polish aimed against the interests of the Polish state and Polish citizens.

In view of the arbitrary and illegal orders of the American occupational authorities, the Polish Government does not of course see any possibility for members of the Polish Repatriation Mission to remain in the American zone and therefore they are being recalled as of June 15, 1951.

The Polish Government at the same time lodges its firm protest against these orders responsible for the liquidation of the Polish Repatriation Mission and demands that they be revoked. The Polish Government holds the United States Government entirely responsible for rendering impossible the continuation of repatriation activities.

TEXT OF U.S. NOTE OF JULY 19

[Released to the press July 19]

The American Embassy in Warsaw delivered today to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs the following note in reply to a Polish Government protest concerning the termination of accreditation of the Polish Repatriation Mission in the United States Zone of Germany:

The Embassy of the United States of America presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and on instructions from the Government of the United States has the honor to reply

as follows to the Ministry's note of June 13, 1951, concerning the termination of accreditation of the Polish repatriation mission in the United States zone of Germany.

As the Polish Government is aware, repatriation mission personnel are accredited to the United States High Commissioner for Germany who has the responsibility of determining the size of the mission on the basis of the number of displaced persons with which the mission is properly concerned. From July 1, 1947, to December 31 1950, the Polish voluntary repatriates from the United States zone totaled 12,504. Of this number, only 410 volunteered for repatriation in 1950. Moreover, during the first 5 months of 1951 there were only 27 voluntary repatriations of Polish citizens from the United States zone.

There is no Polish displaced persons camp in the United States zone and only one International Refugee Organization repatriation camp at Griesheim near Frankfurt. Thus, since the period of mass repatriation had clearly come to an end, the continued presence in the United States zone of eight Polish repatriation officials could no longer be considered necessary.

A procedure exists, in the absence of a Polish repatriation mission, for returning those few persons who might from time to time volunteer for repatriation to Poland. Arrangements in each case can readily be made by the Polish Military Mission at Berlin with the United States High Commissioner's office. This was pointed out to the chief of the Polish Repatriation Mission in the United States zone in a letter of May 16, 1951, from the United States High Commissioner's office requesting the withdrawal of the mission. The United States Ambassador at Warsaw also stressed in a conversation with the Secretary General of the Foreign Office on June 12, 1951, that facilities for Polish repatriation have not been terminated as arrangements for this purpose can readily be effected by the Polish Military Mission at Berlin, in agreement with the office of the United States High Commissioner.

Under these circumstances the United States Government categorically rejects the charge made by the Polish Government in its note of June 13, 1951, that American authorities in terminating the accreditation of the Polish mission in the United States zone of Germany are rendering impossible the repatriation of Polish displaced persons who wish to return to Poland.

Moreover, since the Polish Government continues to have the possibility of making arrangements for voluntary repatriates, there has been no violation of Polish rights under the United Nations General Assembly resolutions of February 12, 1946, and November 17, 1947, or under resolutions contained in the report of April 23, 1947, to the Council of Foreign Ministers.

The actual facts concerning the unwarranted charge of the Polish Government that American

officials have hindered the repatriation of Poles are as follows:

1) United States officials have provided extensive logistical support to the Polish Repatriation Mission, including authorization for free train travel throughout the United States zone of Germany, facilities for vehicle registration and purchase of gasoline from United States Army supplies, United States post-exchange privileges and commissary privileges for the Chief of Mission.

2) No protest has ever been received from the Polish Mission that its activities in the repatriation of dependent persons resident in the United States zone of Germany were obstructed by United States zonal authorities.

3) The record shows that Polish representatives were free to visit International Refugee Organization camps as frequently as they wished, and that these visits often averaged three a week.

4) The Polish Repatriation Mission did not publish a periodical in Germany, but rather imported quantities of magazines and newspapers from Poland. The question of paper allocation and licensing therefore did not arise.

The Polish Government has included in its

note various misstatements concerning United States statutes governing military service. The reference to the "law approved on April 13, 1951," was apparently intended to relate to Public Law 51, enacted June 19, 1951. Public Law 51 is essentially a continuation of the Selective Service Act of 1940 under which many thousands of legally admitted aliens fought for the freedom and survival of the allied nations, including Poland.

The Polish Government's statement concerning "displaced persons . . . as reserve manpower" is presumably directed at plans announced by the United States Secretary of the Army for the implementation of the Act of June 30, 1950, providing for voluntary enlistment of a limited number of aliens in the Regular Army of the United States. It would seem singularly inappropriate that exception to this law should be taken by the Government of Poland, many of whose present leaders have frequently and recently called attention to the brilliant feats of arms by Generals Kosciuszko, Pulawski, E. Bem, and Walter, and whose own national anthem is still the song of Dabroski's soldiers in Italy.

United States Policy Toward the Middle East

by George C. McGhee

*Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern, South Asian and African Affairs*¹

The Middle East is described in the Institute's program as being that area stretching from the western border of India to the western border of Libya. This area is the cradle of Western civilization, the birthplace of the three great monotheistic religions and the area which preserved the light of culture and learning during the Dark Ages of Europe. It is one-third again as large as the United States and has a population of over 150 million people, the same as our own. Its territories are the crossroads of the world. Its great strategic importance is evident from a quick glance at the globe. Here three continents meet. Every major international airline connecting Asia, Europe, and the United States passes through the Middle East. The Suez Canal is of immense importance to world shipping. The Middle East contains one-half of the proven oil reserves of the

world and supplies a large proportion of the oil requirements of Europe, Asia, and Africa.

Over and above its own importance, the Middle East provides access to South Asia with its tremendous resources of manpower and raw materials, and to the continent of Africa where the resources which we have imported for a number of years—copper, manganese, chrome, industrial diamonds, rubber—have now been augmented by uranium from the Congo. The strategic importance of North Africa, which provides an access to the European Continent from the south, was clearly demonstrated during World War II.

The Middle East is the heartland of Islam—the religion of 300 million people who inhabit the warm belt from the Atlantic shores of Africa to Indonesia and the Philippines in the South West Pacific. Paradoxically, though the recorded history of the Middle East is older than any other part of the world, it contains more new nations. The spirit of nationalism which swept through Europe and the Western Hemisphere in recent centuries is affecting all of Asia profoundly today.

¹ Address made before the University of Virginia Institute of Public Affairs at Charlottesville, Va., on July 10 and released to the press on the same date.

Strong Aspirations Influence Middle East

The peoples of the Middle East are greatly influenced by three strong aspirations. First, they are passionately dedicated to retaining and strengthening the independence which they have won. Most are suspicious of outside influences, including that of the West. At times, some are more alarmed at what they mistakenly consider as Western imperialism than they are over communism.

Second, the people of the area are determined to exercise their full share of responsibility in the collective effort to stabilize the world situation. Their ideas as to how this should be accomplished often differ from our own, as for instance, the views of the so-called Arab-Asian bloc on Korea and Communist China's intervention there.

Third, the people in the Middle East seek to raise their standard of living and to eliminate the poverty, starvation, and disease which have hung over most of the area for centuries. The desire is growing to overcome inefficient production methods, illiteracy, and corruption.

These objectives are strikingly like those to which Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, Richard Henry Lee, George Mason, George Washington, Madison, Monroe, and other distinguished Virginians devoted their lives. In striving to attain these objectives, we in the United States have been blessed with comparatively long periods of peace and a country rich in natural resources. The peoples in the Middle East have not been so fortunate.

Other Problems To Be Settled

Apart from their basic economic and social problems and their difficulties as new weak states, there are certain other specific major problems currently existent in the Middle East: (1) continuing Soviet-inspired pressure on the area; (2) economic dislocation in Greece caused by World War II and the subsequent Communist-inspired guerrilla warfare; (3) the British-Iranian oil controversy; (4) trends toward neutralism; (5) Anglo-Egyptian relations including the future of the Sudan; (6) the military weakness of certain states; (7) unsettled issues remaining from the Palestine question including the problem of the Arab refugees; (8) the role of the Middle Eastern area in the international community of nations.

The northern countries of the Middle East—Greece, Turkey, Iran, and Afghanistan—are all adjacent to the Soviet Union or areas which the Soviets dominate. Soviet pressure against these states and against the general area of the Middle East has been unrelenting. Its roots lie deep in traditional Russian foreign policy. We know from the documents on Nazi-Soviet relations that Molotov stipulated to Hitler on November 25, 1940, that the "area south of Batum and Baku in the general direction of the Persian Gulf" be recognized "as the center of the aspirations of the

Soviet Union." We have no reason to believe that there has ever been any alteration of this aspiration. Indeed, the actions of the U.S.S.R. since the end of World War II clearly indicate that more than ever this is still her objective. These actions include the Communist espousal of the guerrilla warfare in Greece from 1946 through 1948, continuous Soviet pressure on Turkey, the creation of a puppet government under Soviet protection in Azerbaijan in Iran in 1946; and sustained Soviet efforts to fan anti-western sentiment throughout the area. In posing as the anti-imperialist champion in the United Nations, the principal contribution of the imperialist Soviet Union has been to sow seeds of mistrust and hostility toward the nations which wish to aid the new Middle East states in strengthening themselves.

U.S. Organizations Established for Assistance

The Truman Doctrine of March 1947 was the American answer to Soviet-inspired pressures on Greece and Turkey. Since that time, the United States has expended some 2 billion dollars in building up these two countries. We have provided military and economic aid which has strengthened the capabilities of these two valiant peoples to resist aggression and has eased their economic burdens. The established Greek Government successfully liquidated the guerrilla activities. Greece is now one of the nations valiantly contributing military assistance in Korea.

The economic situation in Greece at the end of World War II was one of near collapse. When I first went to Greece in 1947 on an inspection trip as coordinator of the program for assistance to Greece and Turkey, the country's highways, canals, railroads, and ports were in deplorable condition after a long period of war and enemy occupation. The initiative of the people of Greece, coupled with timely assistance from the United States, have put the country's economic facilities back in operation.

Turkey has also clearly demonstrated her determination to stand firm. We regard her as one of our staunchest allies. We share her pride in her magnificent record in Korea. Both Greece and Turkey have indicated a desire to enter into reciprocal security arrangement in which the United States is included. As membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization appears to be the most logical method of concluding such security arrangements, we have raised the question of Greek-Turkish admission with the other NATO powers who are currently considering it.

When the Soviet Union left military forces in Iran in 1946, contrary to her previous commitment to the United Kingdom, the United States, and Iran, the United States gave strong support to the Iranian case in the United Nations Security Council. It is our belief that Iran's steadfastness

and her support by the United Nations, in which the United States played an important role, caused the U.S.S.R. to back down and to withdraw her troops.

The United States has also demonstrated its deep interest in helping Iran by supplying grant military assistance. Through our current Mutual Defense Assistance Program, we are supplying equipment as quickly as the Iranians can effectively absorb it, and American officers are assisting in training the Iranian Army in its use. This army not only contributes to internal stability but also helps to discourage external aggression.

Oil Controversy Creates Serious Situation

You know, of course, of the present controversy between the Iranian Government and the British Anglo-Iranian Oil Company concerning the operation of the Iranian oil industry. This controversy has created a serious situation. Its origin stems from the desire of the Iranian Government and people to nationalize their oil resources, and the difficulty in developing an arrangement under which the British oil interests can continue to cooperate in the production, processing, and marketing of Iran's oil. Although the British have recognized the principle of nationalization, the two parties to the controversy have not yet been able to find an agreement as to how the nationalization can effectively be implemented.

A solution to this problem is, of course, of very great importance not only to Iran and Great Britain but to the entire free world. The Iranian economy depends largely upon the exploitation of its oil resources, and any interruption in the flow of oil will have an immediate impact upon the people of that country. The British economy and the economies of many countries throughout the world rely heavily upon Iranian oil shipments. While Iranian oil and refining capacity can be substituted for in other world markets, their loss would compel radical and costly adjustments in oil production and refining throughout the world.

Last week, the dispute between Iran and Great Britain was considered by the International Court of Justice at The Hague. The Court recommended that both parties adopt a *modus vivendi* which would permit the continued operation of the oil industry pending the development of a permanent solution. On July 9, President Truman, in a letter to the Prime Minister of Iran,¹ urged that the Iranian Government, notwithstanding legal technicalities as to whether the Court did or did not have jurisdiction, a question which has been raised by the Iranian Government, give most careful consideration to its utterance, which was a suggestion of an impartial body dedicated to justice and equity and to a peaceful world based upon these great conceptions. He said that a study of the Court's suggestion by the Iranian and British

Governments could develop methods of implementing it which will carry out its wise and impartial purpose; that is, of maintaining the operation of the oil industry and preserving the positions of both governments. We earnestly hope that Iran will give full weight to the Court's finding. If this is done, Iran's stature, as the President said, would be greatly enhanced in the eyes of the world.

U.S. Policy Supports Independence Movements

The anti-western and neutralist tendencies in certain parts of the Middle East are a cause of considerable concern. There have been indications that some very sincere nationalists share these sentiments. We have sought during the past several years, both in the United Nations and outside, to pursue a moderate and sympathetic role with regard to nationalism. It is our traditional policy to support orderly movements toward self-government. We have been pleased with the establishment of many new nations in Asia—India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Burma, the Philippines, Indonesia; the Associated States of Laos, Cambodia, and Viet Nam; and Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, and Israel in the Middle East.

The United States is also closely bound to the Western European nations through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and through other strong ties. Certain of these nations, the United Kingdom and France in particular, have long been interested in the development of the Middle East. In so far as possible, we have sought to strengthen the ties between the Western nations and the new nations of the East. We are not unmindful of the fact that there exist serious difficulties between certain of the Middle Eastern countries and the Western nations—difficulties such as the resentment of the Arab States arising out of our policies and those of other Western states in Palestine, and the impasse between the Egyptians and British regarding the future of British forces in Egypt under their treaty of alliance. We seek, however, to minimize these differences and to capitalize on common interests; to convince the Middle Eastern states that their aspirations can best be achieved in company with the West; that there is no neutral ground where aggression is concerned and that their best hope for survival lies in firm support of the principle of collective security.

There exists a weakness in the military, economic, and social structures of a number of states in the Middle East. Throughout the Middle East, as indeed in the remainder of the vast undeveloped areas of the world, people are impelled by a basic reality—the fact of poverty among potential plenty. People are living on an income of less than 100 dollars a year per person as compared with our average of 1400 dollars. These people are demanding more and more that they share in the world's progress. They know that their lands

¹ BULLETIN of July 23, p. 129.

can be made more productive, and that their rivers can be brought under control for irrigation and power.

The economic background of the Arab states and Israel was brilliantly described in the report of the U.N. Survey Mission to the Middle East, headed by Gordon Clapp, who is to address you tonight. This report clearly demonstrates that peace and stability cannot be achieved in the Middle East until the standard of living is raised. It recognizes, however, that will be a long and difficult process requiring development of unused agricultural lands and potential water resources. Some of the countries of the Middle East have been able to earn foreign exchange through sales of their own raw materials such as cotton from Egypt, oil from Iran, Saudi Arabia, and Iraq. However, most of the countries in the area have little means with which to generate an excess of imports over exports. Many of these countries already have mapped programs, some of a far reaching nature, for economic development, and it is our earnest hope that these countries will press forward their programs with energy, imagination, and hard work.

The United States Government has been acutely aware of the economic, social, and military weakness in the Middle East area. Because of the limitations on our over-all capacity to assist other nations to strengthen themselves, we have not been able to do all that we should have liked to have done in this area. The necessity for expending our efforts in Europe and in the Far East during the past several years limited our effort in the Middle East with the exception of Greece and Turkey. With respect to the rest of the area, we have sought to help through the granting of loans, as for instance to Iran, Saudi Arabia, and Israel. We have always stood ready to consider requests for loans from other nations. In addition, some of the nations have sought and continue to seek loans from private and international agencies.

In January 1949, President Truman announced in his inaugural address what has since become known as the Point Four Program, to make available technical assistance for the undeveloped countries. This program has been accepted by almost all of the countries of the Middle East and is now well under way. However, because of the urgent necessity to strengthen the free world as rapidly as possible, the President sent a message to the Congress on May 24, 1951, which recommended that the Congress take further steps to help build up the countries in the Middle East as a part of the Mutual Security Program. I shall describe this program to you in some detail in a few moments.

After the conclusion of World War II, the world community was confronted with the tragic plight of the Jewish peoples who had suffered such inhuman treatment at the hands of Hitlerite Germany. This problem was directly related to the final settlement of the British Mandate in Pales-

tine. The American Government supported the recommendations of the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine in 1947, which called for a partition of that area. This resulted in 1948 in the establishment of the State of Israel. We recognized this state, supported its admission into the United Nations, and extended loans for its development. As is well known, the partition of Palestine left bitter feelings among the Arab States and peoples. I regret to say that these feelings have not yet been dissipated.

The United States, on the basis of a policy of strict impartiality as between Israel and the Arab States, has sought, through the United Nations and through all other possible means, to obtain a solution to the issues which remain from the Palestine question. I am sorry, however, to state that little progress has been made. The principal issue remaining from the Palestine question is the future of almost 900,000 Arab refugees. The plight of these refugees is tragic. They are a ready target for anti-western propaganda and constitute a source of instability in the area. Their bitterness over the loss of their homes and lands is understandably deep. The United States has participated financially and in other ways in trying to solve the problem of the refugees. We have supported strongly the efforts of the Palestine Refugee Agency which a distinguished American, John B. Blandford, has just been named to head.

Mutual Security and the Middle East

I should like now to turn to the President's message to the Congress on May 24, on the Mutual Security Program, particularly as it relates to the Middle East.² In his message, the President set forth our objectives in the Middle East and our plans for attaining them. I note from the preliminary issue of your program that several questions are asked under the heading of the Middle East. They are: Is more help indicated? If so, what kind of help and how can and should it be distributed? I believe that these questions have been answered in the President's message. Without going into too much detail, I shall briefly attempt to give you these answers.

After pointing out that the countries of the Middle East are of great importance to the security of the entire free world; that there is no simple formula for increasing stability and security in the Middle East; and that the countries should be helped to withstand the pressures and advance towards stability and improved living conditions, the President stated as follows:

... To these ends, I am recommending 415 million dollars in military aid for Greece, Turkey, and Iran; a portion of this aid will be available for other Middle Eastern nations if necessary. I am also recommending 125 million dollars in economic aid for Middle Eastern countries, exclusive of Greece and Turkey, for whom economic aid is provided as part of the program for Europe. This

² BULLETIN of June 4, 1951, p. 883.

amount also includes programs of technical assistance to Libya, Liberia, and Ethiopia, three independent states of Africa whose economic problems are similar to those of the Middle Eastern countries.

Continuing military aid for Greece and Turkey will make possible the further strengthening of these countries' large and well-trained armed forces, which have already displayed their valiant resolution in the fight for freedom in Korea. In Iran, continuing military aid is required to help build internal security and defense, together with economic aid to help sustain the Iranian economy and give impetus to the much needed longer term process of economic development for the benefit of the Iranian people

In the Arab States and Israel, the fundamental requirement is a regional approach to the basic problems of economic development

The program I am now proposing is a balanced program for strengthening the security of the Middle East. It will make a solid contribution to our hopes for peace.

The continuation of economic and military aid to Greece, Turkey, and Iran will enable those countries to strengthen further their military forces. The President has proposed that up to 10 percent of the 415 million dollars requested may be utilized in the Arab States and Israel, if he determines such action is essential to the security of the United States. This will permit the United States, for the first time, to assist those states directly in building up their defensive capabilities. The Government believes that it is in the United States interest to preserve and strengthen the ties of these states with the United States and the West; to maximize the will of the Arab States and Israel to cooperate in resistance to any expansionist tendencies of the U.S.S.R.; and to create strength and stability in depth for the benefit of the area as a whole by encouraging the countries to increase their indigenous defensive capabilities, to strengthen their internal security, and reduce area rivalries.

Aside from Greece and Turkey, which participate in the economic aid program for Europe, the economic part of the Mutual Security Program for the Middle East will, subject to approval by Congress, provide grant aid of \$24,050,000 for Iran; \$23,500,000 for Israel; \$23,500,000 for the Arab States; \$3,950,000 for the independent states of Northern Africa, and 50 million dollars for the relief and reintegration of the Arab refugees. In large part, the programs will be directed toward the following fields: Agriculture extension service designed to increase food production by the use of better tools, seeds, fertilizers, and methods of cultivation; improvement of public health and sanitation; improvement of vocational educational practices, and improvement of the road network of the area. Greece and Turkey would, under the Mutual Security Program, continue to receive economic assistance on much the same scale as they have in the past. Pakistan and Afghanistan would, for the first time, be eligible to receive economic grant assistance. The assistance to Iran is not related to the immediate situation in Iran arising out of the oil issue.

The military assistance requested for the Arab

States and Israel follows logically from the policy agreed to by the Governments of the United States, France, and the United Kingdom in May 1950, at the conference of the Foreign Ministers in London. At that time, the three Governments issued a declaration known as the Tripartite Declaration, recognizing that the Arab States and Israel need to maintain a certain level of armed forces for internal security and to play a part in their defense and that of the area as a whole. The three nations also indicated that they would take immediate action in the event of aggression by one state in the area against another. This was a strong declaration, and I am glad to report that the reaction of the countries in the area to the declaration has on the whole been salutary.

In announcing the world-wide Mutual Security Program, the President emphasized three major characteristics of the Soviet threat today: First, it is world-wide; second, it is total, and third, it is of indefinite duration. The program which I have outlined above for the Middle East and South Asian countries is designed to help them strengthen their economies and give their peoples incentive to combat the Soviet threat as described by the President. The assistance program submitted to the Congress is a much more positive and comprehensive program for the Middle East than we have hitherto had. Our original efforts in Greece and Turkey, which we started in 1947, are now expanded, in the President's request, to approximately 1 billion dollars for the Middle Eastern area. We believe the program is based on a balanced, impartial area approach and it will be so administered.

There has been a very natural tendency on the part of the United States, with its traditional attachments to European nations, to focus its attention more on Europe than on other areas of the world. Of course, it is in our common interest to strengthen our relationships with European nations. The President's Mutual Security Program is designed to further strengthen these ties. At the same time, the responsibilities thrust upon us as a result of the shifting trends of history compel us to take into account more and more the importance of the general area of the Middle East as well as Asia as a whole.

There are certain common denominators between the Middle Eastern states and those of the West. We are all basically opposed to Communist expansionism. We all seek to better the way of life of our peoples. Though we may differ in the method of achieving our objectives, we are nevertheless all dedicated fundamentally toward achieving the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. It is incumbent upon all of us to approach common problems with a sympathy and understanding which will lead to a solution of those problems and the strengthening of the entire free world during this hour of peril to the institutions which are basic to our way of life.

U.S. Files Preliminary Objection Regarding Treaty Rights in Morocco

INTERNATIONAL COURT RULING REQUESTED

[Released to the press June 29]

In October 1950 the Government of the French Republic instituted proceedings against the United States in the International Court of Justice concerning the rights of American nationals in Morocco.¹ The Court subsequently set time limits for the filing by the two Governments of written pleadings.² On March 1, 1951, the French Government filed its Memorial with the Court. The United States Counter-Memorial was due on July 1, 1951.

The case before the International Court involves the interests of both France and Morocco as well as of the United States. The Treaty of Fez of 1912 established a protectorate by France over Morocco, pursuant to which Morocco is represented in foreign affairs by France. The French Memorial, and the French application instituting proceedings, had not specified whether the French Government brought this case on behalf of France, on behalf of Morocco, or on behalf of both countries. The United States Government is concerned that both France and Morocco, as well as the United States, should be parties to the case before the International Court and should be bound by the Court's judgment. Since the French written pleadings had not made clear whether the moving party or parties were France, Morocco, or both, the United States Government sought in discussions with the French Government, beginning April 23, 1951, to have this point clarified prior to the filing of this Government's Counter-Memorial. However, representatives of the French Government informed representatives of the United States Government on June 9, 1951, that the French Government was not prepared to make any formal statement concerning the identity of the parties in whose name and on whose behalf the present case has been brought. The representatives of the French Government stated that the application and the Memorial did not require clarification. Accordingly, last week the United States Government filed with the Court, pursuant to its rules, a preliminary objection asking the Court to rule on the identity of the party or par-

ties which had instituted the proceedings and which would therefore be bound by the judgment of the Court in the case.

The United States wishes to secure an authoritative determination by the Court on the rights of American nationals in Morocco pursuant to treaties governing the obligations between France, Morocco, and the United States. This Government is naturally anxious that the case proceed without unnecessary delays, and indeed regretted the necessity of filing a preliminary objection. It is hoped, nevertheless, that the issue raised in the preliminary objection may be disposed of promptly and that it will then be possible to proceed without delay to subsequent phases of the *Moroccan* case.

TEXT OF PRELIMINARY OBJECTION

The proceedings in this case were instituted by an application filed on behalf of the Government of the French Republic on October 28, 1950. On November 22, 1950, the Court issued an order fixing the time limits for presentation by the parties of the written proceedings. Pursuant to this order, the French Government filed its Memorial on March 1, 1951. The United States Counter-Memorial was required to be filed by July 1, 1951.

Before filing a Counter-Memorial and before entering the case on the merits, the Government of the United States has found it necessary to file a preliminary objection in accordance with the provisions of article 62 of the Rules of Court.

The Government of the United States noted, when the application instituting proceedings was filed by the French Government in October 1950, that the application did not clearly specify the parties to the proceeding other than the United States of America. My Government hoped that this lack of specification might be only a formal defect, which would be corrected through a fuller and more definite statement in the Memorial. When copies of the Memorial had been received by the Government of the United States in March 1951, it was observed that the Memorial, like the application, was still not clear and definite in specifying the parties to the case other than the United States of America.

In the view of the United States, the application and the Memorial submitted by the French Gov-

¹ BULLETIN of Dec. 11, 1950, p. 950.

² BULLETIN of Jan. 8, 1951, p. 79.

ernment admit of three alternative possibilities in regard to the identity of the parties in whose name the present proceedings have been instituted (1) the case may be brought by the Government of the French Republic in the name of and on behalf of the French Republic in its own right and capacity; (2) the case may be brought by the Government of the French Republic in the name of the French Republic as Protector of the State of Morocco under the Treaty of Fez, dated March 30, 1912, on behalf of the State of Morocco; or (3) the case may be brought by the Government of the French Republic both in the name of and on behalf of the French Republic in its own right and capacity and as Protector of the State of Morocco under the Treaty of Fez, dated March 30, 1912, on behalf of the State of Morocco.

Having noted the ambiguity in the application and in the Memorial filed by the Government of the French Republic, the Government of the United States sought in discussions with representatives of the French Government to clarify the identity of the party or parties in whose name and on whose behalf the case concerning the rights of American nationals in Morocco had been brought. These discussions continued over a number of weeks, and it was the hope of my Government that a clarification of the point would be obtained so as to make unnecessary the filing of any preliminary objection in this case. The Government of the United States had suggested to the French Government that clarification might be effected either through an amendment of the application or Memorial, or by a written communication addressed to the Government of the United States which could be incorporated in the written proceedings of the case. However, representatives of the French Government informed representatives of the United States Government on June 9, 1951, that the French Government was not prepared to make any formal statement concerning the identity of the parties in whose name and on whose behalf the present case has been brought. The representatives of the French Government stated that the application and the Memorial did not require clarification.

The Government of the United States refers to article 40, paragraph 1 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice. This paragraph provides:

1. Cases are brought before the Court, as the case may be, either by the notification of the special agreement or by a written application addressed to the Registrar. In either case the subject of the dispute and the parties shall be indicated.

Similarly, article 32 of the Rules of Court provides, in part:

2. When a case is brought before the Court by means of an application, the application must, as laid down in article 40, paragraph 1, of the Statute, indicate the party making it, the party against whom the claim is brought and the subject of the dispute. . . .

In the view of the Government of the United States, the application in the present case, as supplemented by the Memorial, does not accord with the above requirements.

The United States is concerned to secure an exact identification of the parties to the present case in order to know in advance what states (and in what capacity so far as France is concerned) would be bound by the judgment of the Court in the present case. This case concerns the rights of American nationals in Morocco under bilateral treaties between the United States and Morocco, and under certain multilateral treaties—the Convention of Madrid of July 3, 1880, and the Act of Algeciras of April 7, 1906—to which France as well as the United States and Morocco are parties. The United States of America would be bound by the judgment of the Court. My Government is concerned that the State of Morocco and also the French Republic, both in its own right and capacity and as Protector of Morocco, should be bound by the judgment of the Court in determining the rights of American nationals in Morocco. My Government refers in this connection to article 59 of the Statute of the Court, which provides:

The decision of the Court has no binding force except between the parties and in respect of that particular case.

The Government of the United States observes that the Government of the French Republic in the past has drawn a distinction between the capacity of France in its own right and France as Protector of Morocco. For example, in a note to the Secretary of State dated January 19, 1917 (Annex A),³ the French Ambassador, replying to the note in which the Government of the United States had recognized "the establishment of the French Protectorate over the French Zone of the Shereefian Empire," said:

In reality the Protectorate established by France in Morocco, with the assent of its ruler, covers the whole of that country, as evidenced by the terms of the Treaty of March, 1912, a copy of which I had the honor of transmitting to you on January 3, 1913. The Spanish rights are mentioned in it (Article 1) as being to be defined by an agreement between the Governments, not of Morocco, but of France and of Spain. Every Power, Spain included, has recognized that our Protectorate was co-extensive with the total area of Morocco.

This note thus makes the point that France may choose to engage in international acts with respect to Morocco in its own right and capacity, without regard to its capacity as Protector of Morocco.

In a comparable situation, in the convention concluded by France and Great Britain on July 29, 1937 (Annex B),⁴ it was stated in the first para-

³ Not here printed; see *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1917*, p. 1095.

⁴ Not here printed. See Command Paper No. 5538, *Convention between His Majesty in respect of the United Kingdom and the president of the French republic for the abolition of capitulations in Morocco and Zanzibar [with Protocol of signature, minute, and exchanges of notes]*, London, July 29, 1937.

graph of the preamble that the President of the French Republic was "acting in his own name and on behalf of his Majesty the Sultan of Morocco." In the latter case, therefore, the French Government made it clear that its international act in concluding the convention was intended to and did bind Morocco.

The Government of the United States also draws attention to the case concerning phosphates in Morocco (Italy/France, before the Permanent Court of International Justice). In its application, the Government of Italy requested that the Court "notify the present Application, in conformity with Article 40, paragraph 2, of the Court's Statute, to the Government of the French Republic, as such, and as Protector of Morocco . . ." *Case Concerning Phosphates in Morocco* (Italy/France), Series C, No. 84, p. 15 (1936).

Should the determination of the Court, in disposing of this preliminary objection, be otherwise than that both the State of Morocco and the French Republic, in its own right and capacity and as Protector of Morocco, are parties to the present case and would be bound by the judgment of the Court on the merits, the Government of the United States would wish to consider the inclusion of a counterclaim or counterclaims in its Counter-Memorial, pursuant to article 63 of the Rules of Court. Should it be determined, pursuant to that article, that under such circumstances a counterclaim of this character could not be joined to the original proceedings, the Government of the United States would have to consider what other steps it must take to safeguard its rights and interests.

The Government of the United States desires to make the following submissions to the Court:

MAY IT PLEASE THE COURT:

(1) To communicate to the Government of the French Republic the present preliminary objection;

(2) To note that the proceedings on the merits have been suspended;

(3) To decide whether the party or parties in whose name and on whose behalf the present proceedings have been instituted consist of

(a) The French Republic in its own right and capacity,

(b) The French Republic as Protector of Morocco on behalf of the State of Morocco, or

(c) The French Republic in its own right and capacity and as Protector of Morocco on behalf of the State of Morocco;

(4) To determine, in the event that the answer to (3) above is other than as stated in (c), whether under article 63 of the Rules of Court the Government of the United States would be entitled to present a counterclaim or counterclaims designed to ensure that the judgment of the Court on the merits would be binding on the State of Morocco

and on the French Republic both in its own right and capacity and as Protector of Morocco;

(5) To note that, pending a decision by the Court on this preliminary objection and without prejudice to the position which the United States may believe it necessary to take in light of the decision, the Government of the United States reserves all rights it now possesses, including the right to file further preliminary objections.

ADRIAN S. FISHER

Agent of the Government of the United States of America

June 15, 1951

Atomic Energy Commission Enlarges Radioisotope Export Program

[Released to the press by AEC July 15]

To assist in extending the scope of international cooperation in science, the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission today enlarged its radioisotope export program to include all radioactive materials now sold in this country on an unrestricted basis, and for the first time made U.S.-produced radioisotopes available to foreign users for industrial research and applications.

The action today increases the number of U.S.-produced isotopes available to buyers in foreign countries from 26 to 99. Among the more useful of the newly-available isotopes are Cesium-137, Yttrium-91, Selenium-75, and Tantalum-182, which all have valuable applications in industrial research; Chromium-51, Nickel-59 and -63, and Tungsten-185, which are useful in metallurgical research, and Rubidium-86, which is a valuable substitute for the shorter-lived Sodium-24 and Potassium-42 in agricultural research.

Today's action also for the first time permits American manufacturers to export radioactive thickness gages, which are finding increasing application in a number of different industrial processes.

The U.S. radioisotope export program has been in effect since September 3, 1947. Since then 34 countries have completed arrangements to receive these radioactive substances and shipments of the 26 varieties of isotopes available have been made to 30 of these for use in scientific and medical research and medical therapy.

The nations which have received shipments up to the present are Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Iceland, India, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom, and Uruguay. In addition,

Guatemala, Ireland, Israel, and Portugal have made arrangements to receive isotopes but have not yet placed orders.

To date, more than 1,000 shipments of U.S. isotopes have been made to foreign nations. The largest users have been Australia, Belgium, Denmark, Sweden, and the United Kingdom.

The isotopes most in demand in foreign countries have been Phosphorus-32, Iodine-131, and Carbon-14. Phosphorus-32 is useful in agriculture and medicine, notably to determine the most efficient ways of using fertilizer, to locate brain tumors, and as a palliative treatment for certain types of leukemia. Iodine-131 is useful in medicine, notably in the diagnosis and treatment of thyroid disorders and the treatment of thyroid cancer. Carbon-14 is useful in a number of different fields, including particularly the study of plant and animal physiology.

In announcing today's action, the Commission said:

Our principal reason for enlarging the radioisotope export program at this time is the very high degree of success with which the program has been operated in the past and the benefits which have been derived from the wide-spread use of isotopes throughout the world. Isotopes produced in the United States have been enthusiastically received by the scientists of foreign lands and the work accomplished with them is contributing importantly to the welfare of all peoples.

There is nothing secret or evil about radioisotopes in the forms in which they are sold in this country and abroad. While their utilization cannot significantly advance the atomic energy programs of nations, they can contribute, and are contributing, significantly to advancements in basic science, medicine, agriculture, and industry. As of today, isotopes constitute the single most important contribution of atomic energy to peacetime welfare.

Enlargement of our isotope export program is, we feel, in keeping with the foreign policy of the United States, which calls for aid to foreign nations in peaceful development, and, even in the absence of international control of atomic energy, constitutes a field in which international cooperation can be increased.

The new isotope program also permits the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, which produces most U.S. radioisotopes, to provide special irradiation services to scientists of other nations. Under this program, foreign scientists may send special materials to Oak Ridge to be made radioactive by exposure to the intense neutron radiation in the nuclear reactor there.

The number of foreign scientists who are familiar with isotope research techniques has been increased considerably in recent years, partly through attendance by scientists of other nations at the Isotope School of the Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies at Oak Ridge, Tenn.

The radioisotopes that can now be exported under the newly-enlarged program are as follows (asterisks mark those that were previously available):

Antimony 122, 124, 125*	Osmium 185, 191, 193
Argon 37	Palladium 103, 109
Arsenic 76*, 77*	Phosphorus 32*
Barium 131, 137, 140	Platinum 197
Bismuth 210	Polonium 210
Bromine 82*	Potassium 42*
Cadmium 109, 115 (2.3d), 115 (43d)	Praseodymium 142, 143, 144
Calcium 45*	Promethium 147, 149
Carbon 14*	Rhenium 186, 188
Cerium 141, 143, 144	Rhodium 105, 106
Cesium 131, 134, 137	Rubidium 86
Chlorine 36*	Ruthenium 97, 103, 106
Chromium 51	Samarium 153
Cobalt 60*	Scandium 46*
Copper 64*	Selenium 75
Europium 152, 154	Silver 110*, 111*
Gallium 72	Sodium 24*
Germanium 71, 77	Strontium 89*, 90*
Gold 197, 198*, 199	Sulfur 35*
Hafnium 181	Tantalum 182
Indium 114	Technetium 97, 99
Iodine 131*	Tellurium 127, 129, 131
Iridium 192, 194	Thallium 204
Iron 55*, 59*	Tin 113*, 121, 123*
Lanthanum 140	Wolfmram 185, 187
Mercury 197, 203*	Xenon 131
Molybdenum 99	Yttrium 90, 91
Neodymium 147	Zinc 65*, 69
Nickel 59, 63	Zirconium 95, 97
Niobium 95	

These include all isotopes distributed in the U.S. on an unrestricted basis. One isotope distributed in the U.S. on a limited basis—hydrogen-3 (tritium)—is not available for export.

In order to buy U.S.-produced isotopes, foreign users must agree (1) to furnish the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, upon request, or at intervals of not more than one year, results of progress obtained with the use of radioisotopes procured from its facilities; and (2) to facilitate exchange of information and visits, relative to work with radioisotopes, between qualified scientists, without regard to nationality, in accordance with normal scientific practice. Foreign purchases of U.S.-produced isotopes must be made through a representative in the United States who has been designated by the foreign government to handle all matters connected with isotope shipments to that country.

If and when the demand for any particular U.S.-produced isotope exceeds the supply, no foreign orders will be filled until all domestic applications have been taken care of.

The procedures which foreign buyers must use in ordering isotopes from the United States, as well as information on the procedures U.S. buyers must use in ordering isotopes from Canada and the United Kingdom, are described in the 1951 Isotopes Catalog, available from the AEC Isotopes Division, Export-Import Branch, Oak Ridge, Tenn.

The United Nations and the United States—July 1951

*By Ambassador Ernest A. Gross
Deputy U.S. Representative to the U.N.¹*

There could hardly be a more fitting moment than this in which to take an inventory of the United Nations—and what it means to the American people.

The scope of events now taking place cannot be fully assessed by our own generation. But there are some essential facts which can be judged now as clearly as they will be by future historians.

Korea is not at all the first attempt in history to meet the threat of imperialism and of a degenerate ideology. Frequently, men have confronted an aggressive imperialism seeking world domination. Barbarism has often marched up to the gates of freedom. However, Korea is the first attempt the world community has ever made to organize against such a challenge through collective action of the whole.

Our times are therefore unique in the history of man's struggle for security. But the question is, What are the essential ingredients of effective collective action? We correctly think of security now primarily in terms of the struggle with Communist imperialism. But we should not concentrate our attention too exclusively on their familiar procedures: aggression, displays of force, and subversion. I stress another source of the great danger.

The strategic political frontiers are vital and must be guarded. However, the victim and the target of the Iron Curtain system is the individual. The strategic frontiers of the free world are the minds of free men. I would demonstrate the truth of this by asking you to consider the nature of the world we live in today and the means used by the Communists to achieve their goal of world conquest.

We are cradled in the American way of life. How easy it is for us not to know—and how often we forget—the facts of other ways of life. More than two-thirds of the entire population of the world subsist on a diet inadequate under any

standard. More than one-half are illiterate—without the elementary knowledge we demand of our 7- and 8-year old children. A small minority lives under truly democratic governments.

The Soviet leaders and their satellites survey important sections of the outside world in which the minds of men are full of tension and fear. In addition to suffering from hunger and poverty, large numbers of people look darkly through the hang-over of a recent colonialism. There are the people of the new states—proud and insecure—whose primary concern is to achieve domestic stability and a fitting place in the community of nations. The menace of some seemingly remote aggression is for them a very distant drum. Their concern is more often the threat from across the frontier or even from within. These states and their peoples look toward the United Nations to preserve them from dangers they perceive close to their own doorsteps.

Countless millions who aspire to what the Charter describes as "better standards of life in larger freedom" have yet to take the first steps on the road that leads away from the false promise of communism. We must remember that these people frequently do not embrace Communist slavery of their own free will.

I do not believe it necessary to recount in detail the major problems with which the United Nations dealt prior to Korea, and the successes it achieved. But it should be remembered that the greatest of these successes were those involving disputes between members of the free world. And some of the disputes which are now before the United Nations threaten to explode into conflicts of a sort which have often before in history led to major wars.

It is quite appropriate to speak of the "free world." But I think it is important to agree upon a definition of that term, otherwise we run a serious risk of resting upon a comfortable illusion that there is some kind of magic formula or ritual which binds together all anti-Communist governments and peoples.

¹ Address made before the University of Virginia Institute of Public Affairs, Charlottesville, Va., on July 13 and released to the press by the U.S. Mission to the U.N. on the same date.

U.S. and U.N. Share Common Goals

There is no such formula or ritual. But there is a bond, and it is of decisive importance to our own security to understand what that bond is.

To my mind, the key to understanding is the similarity between the preamble to the Constitution of the United States and the preamble to the Charter of the United Nations. I refer to substance rather than language—to the objectives for which men live and die.

The people of the United States established a constitution "in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

The peoples of the United Nations established a charter to unite the strength to create conditions under which justice can be maintained, to insure international peace and security, to provide for common defense against aggression, to promote social progress and better standards of life, to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights. These are the common elements: justice, peace, common defense, promotion of welfare and liberty. The parallel is of course not accidental.

The "free world" comprises those peoples which support and wish loyally to carry out the principles of the United Nations Charter. I do not think there is any other common denominator.

Certainly individual men and women everywhere aspire to these purposes. The tragedy of the slave world is the forcible suppression of human aspirations. But what characterizes the free world and constitutes its only valid definition is common adherence to the principles of the United Nations Charter. Men everywhere who are free to think for themselves know that these also are our fundamental principles.

This truth has for us such a momentous significance that I believe we would fail to realize it only at the gravest risk to our security. For what must concern us, along with our own national integrity and well-being, is to prevent the fragmentation of the world and the subjection of men to the new barbarism. This would inevitably happen if the one common bond of the free world were to be destroyed.

The Soviet leaders who signed the Covenant of the United Nations Charter in San Francisco in 1945 soon learned that they had subscribed to a set of principles and joined an organization which could not be deformed into an instrument of Soviet control. The record of their relationship to the Organization since 1945 is a record of obstruction, nonparticipation, walk-out, and finally, in the case of Korea, overt aggression against the Charter.

It is a curious fact which we of the United States delegation to the United Nations have frequently observed that the Soviet leaders have usually attacked actions of which they did not approve by asserting that such actions were "contrary to the

Charter" or "illegal under the Charter." This we have felt to be an unconscious tribute to the moral strength of United Nations principles which, as in the case of the Scriptures, leads an unwilling devil to quote them. Beyond this, it has a great political significance. It reveals the awareness of the Kremlin that in large and important areas of the world encompassed in their plan of conquest, principles of the Charter have a solid and enduring appeal to the minds of men.

U.S. Integrity Important to World Security

There is another important aspect of this matter which relates most directly to the role of the United Nations in our own foreign policy. I think the American people are aware that the greatest single force in the world today is the force of American public opinion. But we do not always realize the extent to which many foreign governments formulate their own policies and make decisions vital to their own national security on the basis of their peoples' faith and confidence in our integrity. It is a constant source of pride to your delegates to the United Nations to observe this in our constant dealings with representatives of other members of the free world.

No one is more aware of the importance of this fact than are the leaders of international communism. They act on the basis that the greatest obstacle upon their own road to world conquest is the confidence of large populations all over the world in our continued support of the United Nations Charter. It is for this reason that they single us out for special attack and accuse us through all their propaganda devices of committing wrongs against the Charter of which in fact they themselves are guilty.

I do not think many people are fooled by this technique. There are undoubtedly some who fail to realize how essential it is for us to retain the confidence which has been so spontaneously and generally reposed in us as the primary guardians of the Charter.

The importance of retaining this confidence must be viewed in the light of the nature of the world in which Communists seek to accomplish their objectives. It must be appraised on the basis of the aspirations which all men share as human beings: aspirations which Communist leadership constantly attempts to betray and to subvert.

All men wish for economic improvement. In terms of the United Nations Charter, this must be defined as cooperative action for the purpose of improving standards of life of people everywhere. The only answer to the false promises of the Kremlin is the cold record of practical accomplishment. This necessarily involves for us the most mature participation in international programs of economic development and technical assistance which take fully into account priorities of effort, sound allocation of our large but limited resources and

energies, and the most effective possible administrative procedures.

Programs of mutual economic assistance for the free world are as much a part of our arsenal of defense as are our military defense programs themselves. The question is not one of choice between them, but of the wisest execution of both.

Men also everywhere aspire to freedom. Our leadership must also necessarily be in the direction of promoting increased observance and application of fundamental human rights and individual liberties. The closed Communist system has not been able to conceal even from the least informed the true nature and significance of the Iron Curtain.

Iron Curtain Is Means of Enslavement

The minds of men are enslaved and corrupted through the device of the Iron Curtain even more than by the lash or the concentration camp. The Kremlin rulers cannot expect to gain the world's confidence so long as they isolate men's minds by vast radio jamming operations, by rigid press censorship, and by prohibiting the circulation of people and of the media of public information. Can the Cominform leaders doubt that their present course is a swamp, breeding suspicion, fear, and mounting tension?

The Iron Curtain is the complete negation of one of the most fundamental principles of the United Nations: the principle of communication of ideas and of information.

We hear talk from behind the Iron Curtain of "co-existence." The concept of "co-existence" is a cold and a blind thing. It creates in my mind a vision of convicts in cell blocks. People do not normally boast of their willingness to allow members of their community to "co-exist" with them. We take this for granted in our own society, and we have stern laws enforcing such a primitive and elementary right. What *we* are proud of is the friendly, mutual, and constructive way of life which builds a *better* existence, not a mere "co-existence."

The Charter of the United Nations looks toward cooperation, rather than mere co-existence; toward harmonizing actions of nations for better existences for all—not in keeping communities whirling in fixed orbits separated by vacuums of space.

In addition to the aspirations for economic improvement and wider observance of human rights and individual freedoms, men everywhere aspire for security in their countries and in their homes. There is no alternative to collective action for the achievement of security. The opposite of collective security is complete insecurity.

The effort of the people of the free world to march toward these goals, to fulfill these aspirations, is the unrelenting target of the Communist conspiracy. This, to my mind, is the decisive significance of Korea.

Korea Jolted Communist Plan of Conquest

The Communist imperialists undertook this enormous risk and engaged upon a course of disastrous folly because the free world was making progress and the United Nations represented the organizational expression of that progress. The Communist master plan of aggression could not hope to succeed without breaking the will to resist and weakening the means of resistance which are found under the flag of collective action.

Whether or not an armistice issues from the negotiations now in progress, the world has succeeded under our leadership in frustrating an overt Communist attempt to demolish the United Nations collective security system. The spontaneous reaction of the free world to the Korean aggression must have shocked those who believed they could terrorize the United Nations into helplessness.

Everyone, no matter how immured behind iron curtains and stone walls, must now be aware that aggression has not been tolerated and that the free world has shown its determination to repel it. There should be no more tragic Communist miscalculations as the one which occurred on June 25, 1950.

The United States Government is confident that the people of the United Nations will not forsake the people of Korea whose land has been devastated by the ruthless and unprovoked aggression of June 25. Nor should there be any illusion that the United Nations will surrender its often stated policy for a unified, independent, and democratic Korea established by the people of Korea.

The Communist master plan for world conquest undoubtedly has been seriously jolted and set back by the United Nations action in Korea. There is of course no evidence to justify the belief that the plan has been abandoned or seriously modified. The strength of the United Nations is growing but we must not permit that strength to be dissipated and along with it the moral unity of the free world.

What do these facts mean to the United States? They seem to me to yield at least one inescapable conclusion. Turn in whatever direction we will, the principles of the United Nations will remain the concrete expression of the aspirations of men and of their hope for security. The only question is whether these aspirations and hopes will come to fruition—however gradually—under our leadership or whether they will be subverted and stunted to the false leadership of international communism.

The minds of free men will either be mobilized under the leadership of those who support the principles of the United Nations, or be regimented under the leadership of those who negate those principles.

We can be certain of this at least. There will be leadership, and the choice of who the leader shall be is ours to make.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

U.S. Invites 50 Nations To Sign Peace Treaty With Japan

[Released to the press July 20]

The United States, as the host Government, extended to 50 nations at war with Japan an invitation to attend a conference at San Francisco on September 4, 1951, for the purpose of concluding a Treaty of Peace with Japan.

The invitation has been extended to the following nations at war with Japan:

Argentina	Iraq
Australia	Lebanon
Belgium	Liberia
Bolivia	Luxembourg
Brazil	Mexico
Burma	New Zealand
Canada	Nicaragua
Ceylon	Norway
Chile	Pakistan
Colombia	Panama
Costa Rica	Paraguay
Cuba	Peru
Czechoslovakia	Poland
Dominican Republic	Saudi Arabia
Ecuador	Syria
Egypt	The Netherlands
El Salvador	The Philippines
Ethiopia	Turkey
France	Union of South Africa
Greece	Union of Soviet
Guatemala	Socialist Republics
Haiti	United Kingdom
Honduras	Uruguay
India	Venezuela
Indonesia	Yugoslavia
Iran	

The Protocol referred to in the invitation deals with technical matters relating to the extension of time for the enforcement of prewar private contracts and negotiable instruments, insurance contracts, etc., and is available for signature by such countries as prefer to deal with these matters by international convention rather than by their own private law. Many countries, including the United States, prefer to rely upon their own negotiable instruments laws and judicial precedents. The Protocol is thus optional and will probably only be availed of to a limited extent. The Proto-

col does not have to be signed at San Francisco but remains open indefinitely for signature.

Copies of the revised text of the Draft Treaty, dated July 20, and two Declarations by Japan are annexed to the invitation.¹

The text of the invitation follows:

The Government of the United States of America and His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom have the honor to enclose herewith two copies of a draft of peace treaty with Japan, of two Declarations by Japan, and of a Protocol. The draft Peace Treaty and the two Declarations have been prepared on the basis of earlier drafts and observations thereon by countries which were actively concerned in the Japanese war. The draft Protocol which is open for signature at any time has been proposed by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom and is circulated for the information and comment of those countries whose domestic law permits them to sign it. It is believed that the enclosed draft Treaty and Declarations combine and reconcile, as far as is practicable, the point of view of all the Allied Powers which were at war with Japan and will establish, with Japan, a just and durable peace.

The Government of the United States of America and His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom will be happy to receive comments on the enclosed draft, which should be addressed to the Government of the United States of America as promptly as is convenient. After receipt of these comments they propose to circulate a final text of the Peace Treaty on August 13, 1951.

The Government of the United States of America has the honor to invite your Government to a Conference for conclusion and signature of a Treaty of Peace with Japan on the terms of that text. The Conference will convene at San Francisco, U. S. A., on September 4, 1951.

Concurrent and identical invitations are being sent to the other Allied Powers at war with Japan, except where special circumstances exist.

The Government of Japan has advised the Government of the United States of America that it will be represented at San Francisco by duly accredited delegates empowered to sign the Treaty and Declarations on behalf of the Government of Japan.

It will be appreciated if your Government will, in due course, notify the Government of the United States of America at Washington, D. C., whether it accepts this invitation.

Any inquiries relating to the organization of the Confer-

¹ BULLETIN of July 23, 1951, p. 132.

ence and the provision of facilities for duly accredited delegates, their advisers and staff, may be addressed to the Division of International Conferences, Department of State, Washington 25, D. C.

President Names U.S. Delegates To Conclude Peace, Security Treaties

[Released to the press by the White House July 20]

The President named the United States delegations to conclude the contemplated Treaty of Peace with Japan, the Security Treaty of Australia, New Zealand and the United States, and the United States-Japan Security Treaty.

The Secretary of State and John Foster Dulles, together with Senator Tom Connally and Senator Alexander Wiley, the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, will be members of all three delegations, with plenipotentiary powers. Additional delegates with power to act as alternates to those above named will be:

For the Japanese Peace Treaty:

Senators John J. Sparkman, H. Alexander Smith, Walter F. George, and Bourke B. Hickenlooper, the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Far Eastern Affairs, and Representatives James P. Richards, Chairman, and John M. Vorys, Minority Member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

For the Australia-New Zealand-United States Security Treaty:

Senators John J. Sparkman, H. Alexander Smith, Walter F. George, and Bourke B. Hickenlooper, the Members of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Far Eastern Affairs, and Representatives Mike Mansfield and Walter H. Judd, the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the House Foreign Affairs Far Eastern Subcommittee.

For the United States-Japan Security Treaty:

Senators Richard B. Russell and Styles Bridges, the Chairman and Ranking Minority member, of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Senators John J. Sparkman and H. Alexander Smith, the Chairman and Ranking Minority member of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Far Eastern Affairs, and Representatives Carl Vinson and Dewey Short, the Chairman and Ranking Minority member of the House Armed Services Committee.

Deputies' Meeting Strengthened Western Powers

Statement by Ambassador at Large Philip C. Jessup¹

I am glad to have this opportunity to discuss the broader aspects of the recent meetings of the four-power deputies at the Palais Rose in Paris.

¹ Made on "Battle Report" over NBC Television Network on July 20 and released to the press on the same date.

These meetings in Paris were merely one of the stages in the continuing difficult relationship between the United States and other members of the free world on the one hand and the Soviet Union on the other. Some results of the meetings are already clear; others may become apparent later.

Since my return I have been asked many times just why we went to Paris. In the broad sense, it is accurate to say that we went to Paris to see if the Russians were ready to enter into honest negotiation on at least some of the issues which split the world today.

These issues stem from the aggressive policies which the Soviet Union has pursued since the end of World War II.

These Soviet policies, backed by excessively large armed forces, have posed a clear danger to the security of the free nations—a danger which became even more acute with the flagrant Communist aggression in Korea. Faced with this deliberate and unprovoked violation of peace, the free nations intensified their efforts to build effective defenses, both individually and within the collective framework set up by the North Atlantic Treaty.

At Paris the deputies of the United States, Great Britain, and France were assigned a relatively simple task by their governments. We were to meet with the Soviet delegate and agree upon a straightforward list of problems at issue among the four powers with relation to the situation in Europe. This list of problems was then to be used as the agenda for a later meeting of the four Foreign Ministers.

We were instructed to ask that these problems be stated fairly and impartially. Beyond this, the Western deputies sought to impose no conditions upon their Soviet colleague. Our task was to indicate the complete willingness of our governments to enter into honest negotiation toward establishment of a genuine and just world peace.

I am sorry to say that, after 4 months and 73 meetings, we were unable to report any indication of a similar willingness upon the part of the Soviet Union.

On the contrary, the Soviet deputy apparently had no idea except to use the Palais Rose as a sounding board for Cominform propaganda. He sought constantly to indict the free nations for their efforts to defend themselves. He seemed to insist that the free nations should agree to bargain away their right to self-defense. For example, he contended that the North Atlantic Treaty was an aggressive pact, which threatened the security of the Soviet Union.

We pointed out that no nation need fear the North Atlantic Treaty unless it had aggressive designs against one of the member states. This simple statement of obvious fact, based upon the treaty itself, had no effect upon the Soviet delegate. He continued to throw up his propaganda

smokescreen and to hamstring the work of the conference.

After the most exhaustive efforts we were forced to the conclusion that the Soviet Union was using the Paris meetings solely in an effort to hamper the defense effort of the free nations. The Soviet delegate sought to throw doubt on our honest motives; he sought to divide us and to confuse us.

He failed. The Western Powers emerged from the Paris meetings more closely united than ever, and with stronger support from their free allies. Public opinion, especially in Western Europe, strongly condemned the Kremlin for its stubborn opposition, and gave fresh strength to the collective defense efforts of the Atlantic Community.

Armistice Negotiations in Korea

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY ACHESON

[Released to the press July 19]

The Communist delegation at Kaesong has raised the question of the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Korea in connection with an armistice. The United Nations Command delegation has stated that it cannot go into this question, which is political in character and can only be settled by the United Nations and the governments concerned.

This is no theoretical argument as to whether the question is political or military. The United Nations forces are in Korea because of decisions made by governments to send them to Korea in response to a request by the United Nations. They are there to repel aggression and to restore international peace and security in the area.

If there is an effective armistice, a United Nations force must remain in Korea until a genuine peace has been firmly established and the Korean people have assurance that they can work out their future free from the fear of aggression. The size of the United Nations force remaining in Korea will depend upon circumstances and, particularly, upon the faithfulness with which an armistice is carried out.

Korea's neighbors know that the presence of United Nations forces in Korea constitutes no danger or threat to themselves. The repeated expressions of policy by the United Nations and, indeed, the very nature of that organization, furnish them entirely adequate guarantees on this point.

Once before, foreign forces were withdrawn from Korea as a part of a U.N. plan to reach a final settlement of the Korean problem. The

The Paris meetings have now passed into history—another chapter in our continuing effort to establish a just peace through honorable means and without the horror of war.

I have no doubt that there will be other such meetings. The mounting strength of the free world must eventually make it clear to the Soviet Union that aggression will not pay.

We closed no doors at Paris. Before the meetings ended, we invited the Soviet Union, together with Britain and France, to attend a meeting of the four Foreign Ministers in Washington. That invitation is still open. If it were not for the opposition of the Soviet Union, the four Ministers would be meeting here next Monday [July 23].

Communists defied this effort and committed aggression against the Republic of Korea. The Korean people can be assured that a repetition of this act will not be tolerated.

U.N. COMMUNIQUÉS

[JULY 16]

Convening for the fourth time, the armistice negotiations continued at 10 a. m. today [8 p.m. July 15, Eastern daylight time].

All procedural matters having been previously agreed upon, only agenda items were open for discussion.

The senior United Nations Command delegate opened the meeting, presenting further arguments in favor of the items on the agenda proposed by the United Nations Command.

After Admiral Joy spent the best part of the morning presenting the views of the United Nations Command delegation, General Nam Il requested a 2-hour recess to enable him to discuss these views with his delegation. Upon reconvening, General Nam Il presented the reaction of his delegation to the views of the United Nations Command.

The conference adjourned at 1:55 p. m. after having agreed to reconvene at 11 a. m. tomorrow, Tuesday, 17 July.

The United Nations Command delegation reports that some progress was made toward the formation of a mutual agreed-upon agenda.

The Communists have fulfilled their agreement with respect to the neutrality of the conference site in that no armed personnel were observed.

The United Nations Command delegation posed for United Nations photographers during the 2-hour recess and the Chinese-North Korean delegation posed after the conference was over.

[JULY 17]

Convening at 11 a. m. Seoul time today [9 p.m. July 16, Eastern daylight time], the fifth session of the Korean armistice negotiations was opened by the North Korean and Chinese senior delegate.

Most of the time of the morning session was taken up by discussion of the items of the agenda proposed by the United Nations Command with both senior delegates participating. In addition, clarification of definitions and translations took considerable time.

The afternoon session of the conference was more formal with the North Korean senior delegate elucidating and explaining details of his proposed agenda. Both the English and Chinese translations appear to have been prepared in advance.

The United Nations Command delegation felt that some progress may be recorded in the conference discussions.

The fifth session adjourned at 2:35 p.m. until 10 a.m. Seoul time, 18 July 1951.

[JULY 18]

The sixth session of armistice negotiations which convened at 9:58 this morning, Seoul time [7:58 p.m. July 17, Eastern daylight time], resulted in some additional progress being made toward the formation of a mutually acceptable agenda on which to base the detailed discussion. Nevertheless, at least one major issue remained unsolved when the conference recessed for the day. Agreement on the key point is essential to the successful completion of the first phase of the negotiations.

In order to hasten the conferences to their ultimate goal, the United Nations senior delegate accepted two points presented by the Communists on the phraseology of agenda items, after placing on the record the United Nations understanding of their basic intent.

Today's meeting moved rather ponderously, as had the previous meetings, due to language difficulties. Since three languages, Chinese, North Korean, and English, are used in the conferences, it was necessary for each statement from either side to be translated two times.

Twice during today's talks recesses were requested. The first, a 2-hour recess, was asked by the North Korean-Chinese delegation at 10:51 a.m. in order to study in detail a revised agenda which was presented by Admiral Joy at the conclusion of his opening statement of the morning.

At 12:55 p.m. the North Korean-Chinese delegation requested through their liaison officer an additional 30-minute recess.

The afternoon session opened at 1:34 p.m. with a statement by the senior Communist delegate which was followed by a detailed exploration by both sides of the points of issue. At 2:37 p.m. the United Nations delegate requested a 15-minute recess.

Shortly after reconvening at 2:54 p.m. the two delegations found an area of mutual agreement on phraseology of the second major point accepted during the day.

The conference adjourned at 3:34 p.m. (Seoul time) and will be resumed at 11 a.m. (Seoul time) tomorrow, 19 July 1951.

[JULY 19]

General Nam Il, North Korean-Chinese delegate, opened the seventh session of the armistice negotiations at 11 a.m. today [9 p.m. July 18, Eastern daylight time] by requesting the opinion of the United Nations senior delegate on the proposed North Korean-Chinese agenda.

Admiral Joy reiterated the United Nations stand that only matters of a military nature would be discussed. General Nam Il then replied with a statement obviously prepared in anticipation of the United Nations reply. The North Korean-Chinese senior delegate occupied the floor for approximately 18 minutes and made it clear that their position was unchanged on the question under debate. About two-thirds of this time was spent in the translation of this statement into English and Chinese.

At the conclusion of General Nam Il's statement, Admiral Joy suggested a 30-minute recess, to which the Communist delegation agreed.

After the recess the conference continued with discussions of the same subject. At 1:22 p.m. no progress had been made. It was agreed to adjourn until 10 a.m. (Seoul time), 20 July, 1951 (Friday).

Charges of Atrocities in Korea Called Propaganda To Discredit U. N. Action

U.N. doc. S/2232
Dated July 6, 1951

Letter dated 5 July, 1951, from the Representative of the United States of America to the Secretary-General

EXCELLENCY:

While President of the Security Council, the Representative of the Soviet Union circulated to the members of the Council a paper entitled "Report of the Women's International Commission for the Investigation of the Atrocities Committed by the United States and Syngman Rhee Troops in Korea."¹ The charges contained in the paper are false. They were fabricated for the purpose of propaganda designed to discredit the United Nations effort in Korea. The purpose of circulating this paper under the guise of a Security Council document is transparent. It is inconsistent with the legitimate functions of the Security Council.

Because this paper has been circulated to the Security Council members, I would ask you, Mr. Secretary-General, to address this communication to members of the Security Council.

The United Nations Forces in Korea have been and are under instructions to observe at all times the Geneva Conventions of 1949 on:

1. the amelioration of the condition of the wounded and sick in armed forces in the field;
2. the amelioration of the condition of the wounded, sick, and ship-wrecked members of armed forces at sea;

¹ U.N. doc. S/2203, dated June 19, 1951.

3. the treatment of prisoners of war;
4. the protection of civilian persons in time of war.

In addition, they have been instructed to observe the applicable portions of the Hague Convention IV of 1907 as well as other pertinent principles of international law. These Conventions and principles have been observed by the United Nations forces.

There exists a legitimate, impartial organization of recognized international standing, one of whose functions is to investigate *bona fide* charges of the conduct of military operations not conforming to international law. The International Committee of the Red Cross is that organization. Its representatives are in a position to observe the conduct of United Nations Forces and have been given access to all information they may desire in order that they may submit a factual and impartial report.

The representatives of the International Committee of the Red Cross, however, as well as the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, have constantly been

denied access to that part of Korea under Communist control.

The Unified Command urges that the conduct of all troops in Korea be subjected to investigation by a neutral and impartial group of recognized international standing, such as the International Committee of the Red Cross. The so-called Women's International Democratic Federation is not such a neutral or impartial group, and its report is nothing other than a falsification designed for propaganda use. The Soviet delegate might pursue a more constructive course if, instead of forwarding propaganda documents to the Security Council, he would direct his influence toward the Communist Command in Korea to permit the customary humane practice of impartial observation and report. Let the International Committee of the Red Cross carry on in all of Korea as it has been doing in the Republic of Korea, its regular humanitarian function, and the United Nations will have an uncolored statement of the facts.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

WARREN R. AUSTIN

U.S. Observes Administration of French Cameroons

*Statement by Ambassador Francis B. Sayre
U.S. Representative in the Trusteeship Council¹*

My delegation considers the record of developments in the Cameroons under French administration during the 2 years under review an encouraging one.

In the political field the advancement has been somewhat less marked than in the economic field. However, a number of significant political reforms either have been introduced or are under consideration. Among these my delegation regards as the most interesting and promising the experiment of introducing in the N'Tem Region the system of village bureaus directed by a committee composed of the heads of families and presided over by an elected chief.

My delegation lays particular stress on the growth of responsible representative local political institutions, and is particularly interested in the development of these small local units.

Another development of importance is the extension of the system of mixed communes to five urban centers in addition to Douala and Yaounde, and it is particularly encouraging to note that the municipal commissions of these new municipalities have African majorities. The members of these commissions are, however, appointed. My

delegation hopes that it will prove possible, particularly with regard to the older of the municipalities (i. e., Douala and Yaounde), to obtain the agreement of the Representative Assembly for the introduction of some kind of electoral system for selecting the members of the Municipal Commissions.

For some time the Council has recommended that the administering authority progressively extend the powers of the territory's Representative Assembly, particularly in the field of legislation. The Council may wish to express the hope that the draft legislation now under consideration, to extend the Representative Assembly's powers, will be adopted and implemented in the near future, and will provide for substantial legislative powers.

My delegation is glad to note the substantial increase in the number of registered electors and is particularly interested in the administration's proposal "to give the suffrage to all persons liable to payment of a lump sum by way of income tax and all persons exempted from this tax". The Council may wish to express the hope that the administering authority will pursue its plans for progressively expanding the electorate with universal suffrage as its objective.

Passing to the economic field, my delegation is pleased at the acceleration of the rate of economic

¹ Excerpts from a statement made in the Trusteeship Council on July 11 and released to the press by the U.S. Mission to the United Nations on the same date.

advancement during the 2 years under review. One index of the extent of economic advancement is the substantial increase in the import and export trade of the territory, an increase in both exports and imports, measured both by volume and by value.

My delegation is impressed with the substantial progress which has been made under the ten-year plan for economic and social development, particularly with respect to the development of new industrial establishments. The policy of the administering authority to associate the indigenous inhabitants in the industrial development of the territory seems to us a particularly happy one. I refer specifically to the plan whereby plants for the processing of palm oil are to be managed by a company in which 50 percent of the shares will be reserved for African subscribers. My delegation hopes that this policy of drawing the indigenous inhabitants into a participation in the industrial development of the territory will be increasingly pursued in the future.

The creation on November 22, 1949, of a new Soil Bureau is of particular interest. It is the hope of my delegation that it will be possible for the people of the territory, under the guidance of officials of this Bureau, to take effective steps to preserve the full soil resources of the territory.

May I mention one additional activity in the economic field? I refer to the active efforts of the administering authority to improve communications within the territory. Future economic development within the territory so clearly depends upon the establishment of an effective all-weather system of communications that my delegation feels that the Council may well wish to commend the administering authority for the attention which it is devoting to road construction in the territory, and to express the hope that it may even find it possible to expand and accelerate its program.

The reports of the administering authority indicate that there has been steady progress in the educational field during 1949 and 1950. The number of pupils in public primary schools has increased from 21,332 in 1949 to 26,682 in 1950. Moreover, the educational budget of the territory which totaled 6 percent of the total budget in 1946 rose to 10 percent in 1950 and 12 percent in the 1951 estimates. These advances, although indicative of the importance which the administering authority attaches to education, must be considered in the context of the magnitude of the problem. Considered in this context, they become less impressive. The administering authority itself in the section of the 1950 report dealing with education indicates its recognition of the vastness of the problem. I refer to page 247 of the 1950 report where it is stated:

... it is evident that ... a great number not only of adults but even of young children are not able to receive knowledge of the first rudiments.

It is also clearly evident that the lack of teachers constitutes perhaps the greatest bottleneck to educational advancement in the territory. My delegation welcomes the opening of the Nkongsamba normal school and hopes that the administering authority will accelerate its efforts in this all-important field of teacher training. It also hopes that bold and imaginative steps will be taken to meet this critical and larger problem of providing adequate educational facilities at all levels. Upon the solution of this problem depends to a large degree advancement in the political, economic, and social fields. Indeed, upon its successful solution depends the entire future welfare of the people of the territory.

In the social field our interest was stimulated by the establishment in 1949 of a Service of Social Affairs and the institution of a program of welfare work with trained social workers.

Another promising new service was established in December 1950 in the field of housing, the *Service de l'Habitat*. The problem of providing adequate housing in the growing towns of the territory is being rendered increasingly acute by the rapid economic expansion which the territory is undergoing.

My delegation has shared the concern of the Council in the past with regard to the relatively low wage rates in the territory, and is glad to note the evidence in the two reports under review of an increasing standard of living for workers. We understand that minimum wage rates were substantially increased in 1950. Nevertheless, in general, wages in the territory still seem to my delegation to be low. The Council may wish to urge that the administering authority continue and extend its study of the standards of living in the territory, review minimum wage rates at relatively frequent intervals, and, in general, make every effort to see that wage rates continue to increase sufficiently rapidly to compensate for prevailing inflationary tendencies.

My delegation was glad to note the evidence of the increasing effectiveness of the medical services in the territory. Since in the long run the medical needs of the territory can only be met by training large numbers of Africans, we found it encouraging that the number of African doctors with degrees from Dakar rose in 1950 from 58 to 61, and that one African received a degree of Doctor of Medicine in France in 1950. Yet these figures are still very small—too small to meet the needs of the territory. We feel that the Council may wish to urge the administering authority to intensify its efforts to train African medical personnel.

I should like to extend my congratulations to the administering authority and to the Special Representative, Mr. Watier, for the excellence of the 1949 and 1950 reports on Cameroons under French trusteeship. These reports have been manifestly prepared with great care.

International Materials Conference

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON SULPHUR AND TUNGSTEN-MOLYBDENUM

Distribution of Tungsten and Molybdenum

[Released to the press by IMC July 8]

The International Materials Conference announced today that the member countries participating in the Tungsten-Molybdenum Committee have accepted the Committee's conclusion that an interim plan of distribution of tungsten and molybdenum for the third calendar quarter of 1951 should be put into operation at once. These allocations will be in the nature of a stop-gap and should not be regarded as establishing a permanent pattern for future allocations. The plan includes an agreement on maximum and minimum prices for tungsten to apply during this period. While the distribution features of the plan were accepted unanimously, one member expressed a reservation with respect to the question of prices.

Eleven member countries are represented on the Tungsten-Molybdenum Committee. They are: Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

This plan has been forwarded to all affected governments for implementation.

The Committee's recommendations, which the participating governments have now accepted, deal primarily with the distribution of ores and concentrates of these two metals, which in both cases are in extremely short supply. The distribution of primary products (i. e., ferro-tungsten, tungsten powder, tungstic acid and tungsten salts, and ferro-molybdenum, molybdic acid and molybdenum salts, including calcium-molybdate and molybdic oxide) has been made the subject of a further recommendation by the Committee to the governments. The paragraphs below should be read as applying only to ores and concentrates of tungsten and molybdenum.

The plan of distribution recommended by the Committee and accepted by the governments is set forth in appendix I attached hereto. The amounts shown for each country include both the quantities obtained from their own production (if any) and from imports.

These tables are to be understood as follows:

1. The figures of quantities are the maximum share of total production in the free world which the consuming country named in the table may retain:
 - a. out of its own domestic production, and/or
 - b. out of imports

in the third calendar quarter of 1951 (i. e., from July 1 to September 30, 1951, both dates inclusive.)

2. For this purpose any quantity exported (i. e., shipped from ports or across national borders) by an exporting country in the period July 1 to September 30, 1951, both dates inclusive, shall be regarded as an import for that period into the consuming country to which the shipment is immediately consigned, unless clear reconsignment instructions accompany the particular shipment. In the latter event, the country to which the shipment is reconsigned shall be regarded as the importing country.

There will be a monthly review of the operation of the plan of distribution by the Committee. In the course of this review, any maladjustments or omissions will be brought to light. Maladjustments in previous allocations will be rectified in the ensuing 6-months period following the end of the quarter under review (i. e. any maladjustments up to September 30, 1951, should be adjusted in the period October 1, 1951 to March 31, 1952). If the actual out-turn of production either of tungsten or molybdenum for the third calendar quarter of 1951 proves to be either more or less than the estimates, upon which the plan of distribution has been based, the excess or deficiency would be distributed among the consuming countries at the same percentage rates as are set forth in appendix I.

Appendix II attached hereto shows the export and import quotas of tungsten and molybdenum ores and concentrates for the third calendar quarter of 1951 resulting from the plan of distribution now adopted.

Consuming countries' governments will be prepared, if necessary, to buy any part of their quotas which their private importers do not purchase,

and producing countries' governments will endeavor to insure to the best of their ability, that estimates of production are realized, thus enabling the agreed quotas to be fulfilled and the pattern of distribution to be followed.

The Committee also emphasizes the importance of full control of exports and imports of these two metals during the present emergency. To assist in insuring that allocations are implemented, full particulars of export licenses granted and actual exports by destination (including re-exports and exports of primary products) will be furnished by all governments to the IMC Secretariat; these particulars will be furnished monthly, within one month after the close of each month. Importing governments will similarly give particulars of imports; returns of imports will be furnished quarterly within one month after the close of each quarter.

Countries also are being asked to furnish monthly figures of production and consumption within one month of the period to which they relate.

In carrying out the arrangements above described, existing contracts will be respected so far as possible. If, however, such contracts provide for the supply of tungsten or molybdenum to any one importing country in excess of the amounts recommended, it is suggested that the importing country should sell shipments to other importing countries which have not yet filled their import quotas so far as possible without upsetting the original contractual arrangements.

The plan of distribution has already been notified to interested governments not represented on the Committee, and they also are being requested to cooperate in the plan. Upon the request of any interested government, the latter may be heard by the Committee to give further explanation of its interest.

All member governments, with the exception of Brazil, agreed to accept certain recommendations with regard to the price of tungsten for the third calendar quarter of 1951. The Government of Brazil reserved its position on the question of prices. The agreement reached was that, as a special measure, applicable to the third quarter, any spot transactions should take place under the following conditions:

Producers will not demand a price higher than 65 dollars per short-ton unit of WO_3 standard grade f. o. b. shipping port (or border, in case of overland shipments), and importers will purchase at prices not less than 55 dollars per short-ton unit of WO_3 standard grade f. o. b. shipping port (or border, in case of overland shipments).

These proposals apply exclusively to spot purchases and will effect no change in any long-term arrangements that may exist or may be negotiated between sellers and purchasers.

The question of longer term contracts is of great importance and is being considered urgently.

With regard to molybdenum, it is agreed that prices will, for the third calendar quarter, be in line with those now prevailing in the United States.

Appendices I and II follow:

APPENDIX I

Plan of Distribution of Ores and Concentrates for the Third Calendar Quarter of 1951

A. Tungsten

	Metric Tons of Metal Content	Percentage of Total Allocated
United States.....	1,255	44.8
United Kingdom.....	695	24.9
France.....	280	10.0
Germany.....	290	10.3
Sweden.....	210	7.5
Other Countries ¹	70	2.5
	2,800	100.0

¹ Divided as follows: Australia 15, Canada 26, Spain 13, Yugoslavia 16.

B. Molybdenum

	Metric Tons of Metal Content	Percentage of Total Allocated
United States.....	3,420	77.8
United Kingdom.....	515	11.7
France.....	195	4.4
Germany.....	125	2.8
Sweden.....	100	2.3
Other Countries ²	45	1.0
	4,400	100.0

² This is a reserve.

APPENDIX II

Schedule of Export and Import Quotas of Tungsten and Molybdenum for Third Calendar Quarter of 1951

(All figures in metric tons of metal content)

A. Tungsten

<i>Exports</i>		<i>Imports</i>	
Asia.....	180	Canada.....	25
Australia.....	165	France.....	175
Belgian Congo.....	35	Germany.....	290
Bolivia.....	600	Sweden.....	160
Brazil.....	125	United Kingdom.....	690
New Zealand.....	5	United States.....	630
Other W. Hemisphere.....	75	Yugoslavia.....	10
Other African.....	50	Other Countries.....	25
Portugal.....	500		
South Africa.....	20		
Southern Rhodesia.....	10		
Spain.....	240		
TOTAL.....	2,005	TOTAL.....	2,005

B. Molybdenum

<i>Exports</i>		<i>Imports</i>	
Chile.....	275	France.....	195
Norway.....	25	Germany.....	125
United States.....	680	Sweden.....	100
		United Kingdom.....	515
		Other Countries.....	45
TOTAL.....	980	TOTAL.....	980

Allocation of Crude Sulphur

[Released to the press by IMC July 11]

In view of the serious shortage of sulphur disclosed by its investigations, the Sulphur Committee of the International Materials Conference has unanimously recommended to governments an allocation of available world supplies of sulphur for the third quarter of 1951. Governments represented on the Committee have accepted these recommendations. The 11 member countries are: Australia, Belgium (representing BENELUX), Brazil, Canada, France, Italy, New Zealand, Switzerland, the Union of South Africa, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

This is an allocation of crude sulphur only. The Committee has not sought to allocate the relatively small quantities of sulphur which enter into international trade as crushed, ground, refined, and sublimed sulphur, or in the form of flowers.

The attached schedule shows the quantity allocated to each country (column 2); the import quota of each importing country (column 3); the export quota (column 4) of the three exporting countries (Italy, Norway, and the United States) whose production has been taken into account by the Committee for the purpose of this allocation. Where the allocation exceeds the import quota, the difference is explained by domestic production or reduction of stocks.

In arriving at these recommendations, the Committee has examined statistics representing total world consumption of sulphur (excluding certain countries for which data are not obtainable). Most of this information has been supplied in response to a questionnaire circulated to member and nonmember governments last April. The Committee also has had the benefit of oral statements from certain nonmember governments who, in response to the Committee's general invitation to nonmember governments to do so, wished to supplement their written replies in this way. The governments heard were: Austria, Ceylon, Germany, Greece, India, Israel, Pakistan, the Philippines, Sweden, and Yugoslavia.

In reaching its conclusions, the Committee has considered a number of factors, including forward requirements, trends of past consumption, the availability of sulphur-bearing materials other than native sulphur, the level of stocks, the conversion programs now under way in certain countries, and the special needs of defense. The results have been reached by common consent of the members of the Committee after careful examination of each individual case.

The figures in the schedule represent firm allocations for the third quarter of 1951. The Committee intends to recommend, by September 10, 1951, firm allocations for the fourth quarter.

The Committee has officially notified all interested governments of these arrangements.

The Sulphur Committee has set up a Management Subcommittee to deal with any procedural problems which may arise in connection with the allocation scheme.

Following is the Schedule of Allocation:

*Allocation Schedule of Crude Sulphur for the Third Quarter of 1951
(in 1,000 long tons)*

Country (1)	Allocation (2)	Import quota (3)	Export quota (4)
Argentina	8.2	0.0	-----
Australia	31.6	21.6	-----
Austria	6.5	6.5	-----
Belgium and Luxembourg	17.8	17.7	-----
Brazil	13.5	13.5	-----
Canada ¹	-----	-----	-----
Cuba	2.9	2.9	-----
Finland	4.5	4.5	-----
France	31.2	27.7	-----
French North Africa	4.5	4.5	-----
Germany	15.1	5.1	-----
India	11.4	11.4	-----
Israel	1.0	1.0	-----
Italy	36.0	-----	17.7
Netherlands	0.6	0.5	-----
New Zealand	16.6	16.6	-----
Norway	6.3	-----	18.7
South Africa	16.2	16.2	-----
Sweden	15.1	11.6	-----
Switzerland	6.8	6.8	-----
United Kingdom	106.3	105.0	-----
United States	1,050.0	-----	250.0
Oil Refineries in Bahrain, Lebanon, Netherlands An- tilles, Trinidad, Indone- sia, Iran.	8.5	8.5	-----
Other Countries	4.8	4.8	-----
TOTAL	1,415.4	286.4	286.4

¹ The Canadian allocation is included in the United States figure in column 2.

² Does not include 10,000 tons of crude sulphur to be exported as refined.

U.S. Member Named To U.N. Criminal Court

The Department of State announced on July 11 that George Maurice Morris had been designated as the representative of the United States on the U.N. Committee on International Criminal Court.

The Committee was established by the General Assembly of the United Nations by a resolution of December 12, 1950, for the purpose of preparing one or more preliminary draft conventions and proposals relating to the establishment and the statute of an international criminal court. The first meeting of the Committee will be held on August 1, 1951, at Geneva. The countries represented on the Committee are Australia, Brazil, China, Cuba, Denmark, Egypt, France, India,

Iran, Israel, Netherlands, Pakistan, Peru, Syria, United Kingdom, United States, and Uruguay.

Mr. Morris was born in Chicago on May 3, 1889. He received a Bachelor of Arts degree from Dartmouth College in 1911 and a Doctor of Jurisprudence degree from the University of Chicago in 1915. Admitted to the Illinois bar in 1915, he began the practice of law at Chicago and moved to Washington in 1919. He has been a member

of the law firm of Morris, KixMiller, and Baar since 1934.

Mr. Morris is a former president of the American Bar Association. He has also served as president of the General Alumni Association of Dartmouth College and of the Alumni Association of the University of Chicago. He is the author of a number of books and articles on legal subjects.

U.S. Delegations to International Conferences

Conference On Public Education

The Department of State announced on July 12 the United States representatives to the fourteenth International Conference on Public Education at Geneva, Switzerland, July 12-21, 1951, under the joint sponsorship of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the International Bureau of Education. The United States delegation is as follows:

- Earl J. McGrath, Ph. D., L. H. D., (*chairman*) Commissioner of Education, Office of Education, Federal Security Agency.
Finis E. Engleman, Ph. D., State Commissioner of Education, Hartford, Conn.
Galen Jones, Ph. D., LL. D., Director, Instruction, Organization and Services Branch, Division of State and Local School Systems, Office of Education, Federal Security Agency.
Raymond F. McCoy, Ed. D., Director, Graduate School, and Head, Department of Education, Xavier University, Cincinnati, Ohio.
H. Arnold Perry, Ed. D., Professor of Elementary Education, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.

The major topic to be considered at the conference, in which more than 80 countries have been invited to participate, will be the problem of making free compulsory education more nearly universal and longer in duration. In preparation for the conference, the International Bureau of Education has undertaken a world-wide general survey of the subject, based on a questionnaire addressed to governments; UNESCO has made studies on compulsory education in six typical countries; and the International Labor Organization has contributed a study of child labor and compulsory education.

It is expected that, by virtue of its emphasis on the topic of compulsory education, the conference will be of particular significance in furthering UNESCO's campaign to make the right of education, as set forth in article 26 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, more generally enforceable.

The two other topics on the agenda for the conference are "School Meals and Clothing Facilities" and "Annual Reports of Ministries of Education for the Year 1950-51."

Ninth World Poultry Congress

On July 19 the Department of State announced that the Ninth World's Poultry Congress will meet at Paris from August 2 through August 9, 1951, under the auspices of the French Government.

Objectives of the Congress will be to stimulate interest in world poultry affairs, to pool information concerning recent developments of the many aspects of the poultry industry, to intensify the fight against disease in poultry, and to encourage the development of scientific research work and education in connection with the production and marketing of poultry products.

The United States, in which the poultry industry is one of the most important branches of agriculture and ranked fourth in the production of gross farm income in 1949, will be represented at the Congress by the following official delegation:

- Berley Winton, (*Chairman*)
Director, U.S. Poultry Research Laboratory,
East Lansing, Mich.

Government Advisers

- Herbert R. Bird, Ph.D.,
Animal Husbandry Division of the Bureau of Animal Industry,
Department of Agriculture
C. Rowena Schmidt Carpenter,
Poultry Branch,
Production and Marketing Administration,
Department of Agriculture
Edward Karpoff,
Bureau of Agricultural Economics,
Department of Agriculture

Industry Advisers

- H. H. Alp,
American Farm Bureau Federation,
Chicago 1, Ill.
- Cliff D. Carpenter, M. S.,
President, Institute of American Poultry Industries,
Chicago, Ill.
- Clyde C. Edmonds,
Secretary and General Manager,
Utah Poultry and Farmers Cooperative,
Salt Lake City 11, Utah
- Arthur D. Goldhaft,
Director, Vineland Poultry Laboratories,
Vineland, N. J.
- Leslie S. Hubbard,
President, National Poultry Producers Federation,
Lancaster, Pa.
- Homer I. Huntington,
Manager, Poultry and Egg National Board,
Chicago 6, Ill.
- R. George Jaap, Ph.D.,
Ohio State University,
Department of Poultry Husbandry,
Columbus 10, Ohio
- Jesse D. Jewell,
President, J. D. Jewell, Inc.,
Gainesville, Ga.
- Roy Lynnes,
Publisher, Poultry Supply Dealer,
Chicago, Ill.
- E. S. McConnell,
Browning Turkey Farm,
Winchester, Ky.
- Kathryn Bele Niles,
Poultry and Egg National Board,
Member of the American Home Economics Assn.,
Chicago 6, Ill.
- Leavitt C. Parsons,
Publisher, "Poultry Industry,"
Boston 16, Mass.
- Thomas W. Staley,
General Manager, Staley Milling Company,
Kansas City, Mo.
- J. D. Sykes,
Vice President, Ralston Purina Company,
St. Louis 2, Mo.
- Alfred Van Wagenen,
Managing Director, Northeastern Poultry Producers
Council,
Trenton 8, N. J.

Discussion will be facilitated by a division of the Congress into five sections which will deal respectively with poultry genetics and incubation; nutrition, physiology, and rearing; investigation of poultry diseases and their control; economic problems, including marketing; and education and organization. An exhibition, which is to be held in conjunction with the Congress, will serve to demonstrate recent improvements in the breeding of poultry and will enable the participants in the Congress to examine a wide variety of materials, food products, and veterinary patents connected with the poultry industry.

The poultry congresses are triennial meetings of the World's Poultry Science Association, organized in 1912 and composed of leaders of the world's poultry industry. The First Congress was held in the Netherlands in 1921, and the Eighth Congress was held at Copenhagen, Denmark, August 20-27, 1948.

History Teaching Seminar

The Department of State announced on July 11 that the United States Government will be represented at a seminar in the teaching of history in elementary and secondary schools, to be held at Sèvres, France, July 18-August 21, 1951, under the sponsorship of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

The United States delegation is as follows:

- John U. Michaelis, Ph. D., (*Chairman*)
Director, Supervised Teaching,
University of California,
Berkeley, Calif.
- Elizabeth Bein,
Teacher, American and World History,
East High School,
Denver, Colo.
- Ruth M. Robinson,
Supervisor, Elementary School Social Studies,
Cleveland, Ohio.

Dr. Howard R. Anderson, Associate Chief, Secondary Schools, Division of State and Local School Systems, United States Office of Education, will be one of the seminar group leaders.

Participants in the Seminar on the Teaching of History as a Means of Developing International Understanding will seek to attain their objective through comparative study of history teaching in the elementary and secondary schools of the various countries represented, through discussion of educational and technical problems common to all history teachers, through examination of questions relating to the training of history teachers for primary and secondary schools, and through the drafting of plans for post-seminar activities to be carried out in their respective countries.

In making arrangements for the work of this seminar, UNESCO has stressed the importance of taking into account actual curricula, rather than emphasizing the ideal curriculum of history teaching, and of studying the different systems of history teaching in effect in order to find means for using the better systems more extensively.

This seminar, in which there will be some 80 participants, will be one of the links in a series begun by the Seminar on the Teaching of Geography as a Means of Developing International Understanding held in 1950 at MacDonald College in Canada. It will also further the work of the Seminar on the Improvement of Textbooks, particularly history books, held at Brussels in 1950, where two working groups initiated studies of problems relating to syllabuses of history teaching and to the publication and exchange of history books.

"The United States in the United Nations,"
a weekly feature, does not appear in this issue but will be resumed in the issue of August 6.

Congress Asked for Further Measures on Illegal Entry of Migrant Workers

VIOLATIONS OF CONTRACT TERMS WITH MEXICO CAUSE CONCERN

Message of the President to the Congress

[Released to the press by the White House July 13]

I have approved S. 984, an Act relating to the recruitment and employment of agricultural workers from Mexico.

If promptly followed up by other needed measures, this Act can be a first step toward a comprehensive program to bring badly needed improvements in the living and working conditions of migratory farm workers, both foreign and domestic. At the same time, this Act can help to assure an adequate supply of labor to meet the needs of American agriculture. On the other hand, if enactment of this legislation becomes an excuse for delay on these other measures, it will hamper our efforts to meet more basic problems—including the pressing problem of illegal immigration.

For that reason, I could not have given my approval to this Act had I not been assured by congressional leaders that supplementary legislation and appropriations would receive prompt consideration at this session.

For many years, the Mexican Government, by agreement with the United States, has allowed its citizens to come into this country on contracts with agricultural employers to assist in harvesting vital crops—principally cotton, sugar beets, citrus fruits, and vegetables—and mostly in the southwestern part of the United States.

During and since the last war, the recurrent shortages of farm labor in the United States have made the addition of contract workers from Mexico a vital factor in bringing in the crops. Last year, for example, 70,000 Mexican workers were legally admitted to this country for contract work during the harvesting season.

However, both this Government and the Mexican Government have become increasingly concerned about violations of the contract terms under which Mexican citizens are employed in this country. We must make sure that contract wages will in fact be paid, that transportation within this country and adequate reception centers for Mexi-

can workers will in fact be provided. It is necessary, therefore, that this Government be able to stand behind all contracts and guarantee performance in the future, if any more Mexican citizens are to be legally recruited for work in the United States. Until this can be done, Mexico has taken steps to terminate the agreement under which her citizens were brought to this country in the past and will make a new agreement only if these guarantees are given.

It is the purpose of S. 984 to give this Government the authority needed to make a mutually satisfactory new agreement with Mexico, which would include these guarantees. Under the terms of this Act, the United States Government, subject to a fixed reimbursement by the employer, will be able to recruit and transport Mexican workers to reception centers in this country, to house and care for these workers until they are employed, to help them make arrangements with American employers, and to guarantee performance by employers of the terms of their employment contracts.

With this authority, it should be possible to reach a new agreement with Mexico. This Act will thus take care of one immediate problem, the harvesting of crops this year. It will also undoubtedly improve the situation of Mexican workers brought into this country for contract work. A government-to-government guarantee of wages and work standards for these workers will be a real step forward.

But this is very limited progress, which hardly touches our basic farm labor problems. The really crucial point, which this Act scarcely faces, is the steady stream of illegal immigrants from Mexico, the so-called "wetbacks," who cross the Rio Grande or the western stretches of our long border, in search of employment. These people are coming into our country in phenomenal numbers—and at an increasing rate. Last year 500,-

000 illegal immigrants were apprehended and returned to Mexico. In 1949 less than 300,000 were returned.

There are many thousands of these people who have escaped detection and remain in this country today. Thousands more will find their way here before the year is out. Since these unfortunate people are here illegally, they are subject to deportation if caught by our immigration authorities. They have to hide and yet must work to live. They are thus in no position to bargain with those who might choose to exploit them.

And many of them are exploited, I regret to say, and are left in abject poverty. They live always under the threat of exposure and deportation. They are unable, therefore, to protest or to protect themselves.

The presence of these illegal workers has a seriously depressing effect on wages and working conditions in farm areas throughout the southwest. The standards of living and job opportunities of American farm workers are under constant downward pressure. Thousands of our own citizens, particularly those of Latin descent, are displaced from employment or forced to work under sub-standard conditions because of the competition of these illegal immigrants.

Everyone suffers from the presence of these illegal immigrants in the community. They themselves are hurt, first of all. Our own workers—as well as the legal contract workers from Mexico—are hurt by the lowering of working and living standards. And the farmers are hurt, too. Instead of a well trained, reliable supply of workers, they are increasingly dependent on a rapidly shifting, ill-trained domestic labor force, supplemented legally or illegally from foreign sources. They face a crisis in their labor supply at every season. They are forced, year after year, to makeshift last minute measures to save their crops.

The President's Commission on Migratory Labor, in its recent report on the situation throughout the Nation, put the issue this way:

Shall we continue indefinitely to have low work standards and conditions of employment in agriculture thus depending on the underprivileged and the unfortunate at home and abroad to supply and replenish our seasonal and migratory work force? Or shall we do in agriculture what we already have done in other sectors of our economy—create honest-to-goodness jobs which will offer a decent living so that domestic workers, without being forced by dire necessity, will be willing to stay in agriculture and become a dependable labor supply? Just as farm employers want able and willing workers when needed, so do workers want reliable jobs which yield a fair living. Neither is being satisfied.

S. 984 does not face up to that basic issue.

The Act does, it is true, provide that Mexican workers may not legally be brought in unless the Secretary of Labor certifies a real shortage of domestic workers. The Act also provides that employment of Mexican contract labor must not adversely affect wages or working conditions of domestic workers. But these safeguards have lit-

tle meaning so long as illegal immigration continues—so long as illegal workers are in fact used by American employers to take the place of other workers.

If we are to begin to meet the basic problem, we must do two things right away. First, we must put a stop to the employment of illegal immigrants. Second, we must improve the use of our domestic labor force. These steps will require more sanctions than our laws now provide and more administrative machinery and services than are now available. Therefore, I recommend that the Congress take the following action:

First, legislation should be enacted providing punishment for the offense of harboring or concealing aliens who have entered this country illegally. While we have a law on the books purporting to make this an offense, that law is not enforceable, because no penalty was adequately provided. This should be remedied at once. In addition, to help discourage the smuggling of aliens, the existing provisions of law punishing transportation of illegal immigrants must be strengthened. While such legislation will be very useful in bringing illegal immigration from Mexico under control, it will also be a valuable addition to our general immigration laws.

Second, legislation should be enacted to clearly establish the authority of personnel of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to inspect places of employment, without a warrant, where they have reason to believe that illegal immigrants are working or quartered. Immigration inspectors are able to cope with known illegal immigrants by obtaining warrants for their arrest. But where there are places of employment, consisting of many acres of land on which many workers are employed and quartered, inspection is necessary to find out whether illegal immigrants are among those workers. The inspections would involve no more, and probably a good deal less, than inspections of mines or factories by public authorities to assure compliance with accident prevention laws. Of course, a farmer's dwelling should be safe from search without a warrant. But there is no reason why other premises which serve as places of employment should not be open for inspection to aid in the enforcement of our immigration laws.

Third, a supplemental appropriation should be made available immediately to the Immigration and Naturalization Service to expand its personnel in the southwest so that all types of enforcement work can be stepped up—including apprehension, investigation, and deportation of illegal entrants. I shall shortly send a budget estimate for this purpose to the Congress.

It is absolutely impossible, without the expenditure of very large amounts of manpower and money, to seal off our long land borders to all illegal immigration. But these three actions by the Congress will give us the tools we need to find

and deport illegal immigrants once here and to discourage those of our own citizens who are aiding and abetting their movement into the country.

In this connection, I am glad to report that the Government of Mexico is contemplating more stringent measures on its own account to help curtail illegal crossings of our border.

As a *fourth* measure for immediate congressional action, I shall shortly forward to the Congress a supplemental budget estimate for the Farm Placement Service of the Labor Department.

It is not enough to take strong action against the stream of illegal immigrants. If we are to make real progress toward solving our basic farm labor problem, we must improve the utilization of our own citizens in the farm labor force, and reduce to a minimum our dependence on foreign sources. As a first step, we need at once to strengthen the machinery of the Department of Labor for surveying labor market needs and recruiting workers to fill these needs. This will be essential if we are to do an effective job under S. 984, in deciding how many contract workers to bring across the border and where they ought to be employed. It will be essential if we are to make this importation of foreign workers truly supplemental to our own resources of farm labor and give the fullest opportunity to those of our citizens who seek employment on the farm.

The additional funds for the Farm Placement Service will be used to expand labor-market studies which will be undertaken in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture. These funds will also permit an expansion of the field staff in rural areas, where large-scale employment of farm labor is required. The aim in these areas will be to find out exactly what workers are needed and find the right workers to do the job.

Finally, these funds will be used to expand the Government's operations in the manner required under S. 984, including transportation and reception of Mexican workers, inspection of contract operations and handling of complaints.

Unless all of these activities of the Farm Placement Service can be built up quickly and effectively, orderly operations under S. 984 will be impossible and we will lose the chance to make full use of our domestic supply of farm workers or to determine on a realistic basis our need for workers from abroad.

These four measures, supplementing the provisions of S. 984, will give us a real program with which to tackle the basic problems of farm labor in the southwest. They will help us also to make a start in other areas where agriculture is dependent on large-scale use of migratory workers.

There is one provision of S. 984 which could interfere quite seriously with our efforts to maintain labor standards in this country. This is the provision which so defines agricultural employment as to allow the Secretary of Labor to bring

in Mexican workers for employment in food processing trades as well as on the farm. It is essential that we keep the importation of Mexican workers from reducing the job opportunities or working conditions of our own citizens employed in these trades. To that end, I believe the Congress should repeal this provision. In the meantime, it will be necessary for the Secretary of Labor to use his discretion with great care and to authorize the employment of Mexican workers in these trades only in case of some genuine, unmistakable emergency.

The measures which I am now recommending to the Congress will not take care of all our problems by any means. The President's Commission on Migratory Labor, a group of distinguished citizens, recently completed an extensive investigation of migratory labor problems throughout the country. The Commission's report was submitted two months ago and is being intensively studied within the Executive Branch. It is a very useful and constructive document and it emphasizes, among other things, that the migratory workers in this country will need specially adapted programs to improve housing conditions and health, education, and social security. They will need these things if they are to develop into the kind of labor force so badly needed in agriculture today—a labor force which really meets the long-run requirements of large-scale "industrialized" farm production.

From time to time, therefore, as the report of this Commission is studied and appraised, I intend to send further recommendations to the Congress, looking toward more improvements in the working conditions and living standards of our migrant workers. Meanwhile, it is my earnest hope that the Congress will lose no time in acting on the recommendations outlined in this message.

HARRY S. TRUMAN

Negotiations for New Agreement on Importing Mexican Workers to U.S.

Conversations looking toward the negotiation of a new agreement for the importation into the United States of Mexican agricultural workers began in Mexico City on Monday, July 16, 1951. The United States Government will be represented by the following:

United States Senate—Allen J. Ellender of Louisiana.

Department of Labor—Assistant Secretary Robert T. Creasey; Jeter S. Ray, Associate Solicitor; Albert D. Misler, Principal Attorney; Don Larin, Chief, Farm Placement Service.

Immigration and Naturalization Service—Argle W. Mackey, Commissioner; Lamont Eaton, Chief Inspector.

Department of State—R. R. Rubottom, Jr., Officer in Charge, Mexican Affairs; and John L. Ohmans of the Mexican Affairs Office.

U.S. Embassy at Mexico—Carl W. Strom, Counselor of Embassy and Consul General; and V. H. Blocker, American Consul.

Africa

- MOROCCO: Rights of American Nationals . . . 179
 U.S. Observes Progress of Trust Territories . . . 190

Aid to Foreign Countries

- ECA: Spain Granted Credit to Purchase Coal, Wheat . . . 170
 Radioisotope Export Program Enlarged (AEC) . . . 181
 U.S. Policy Toward Middle East . . . 174

American Republics**MEXICO:**

- Illegal Entry of Migrant Workers Discussed . . . 197
 Migrant Labor Importation Being Discussed . . . 199

Arms and Armed Forces

- Armistice Negotiations in Korea (U.N. Communiqués) . . . 188
 Unity of Western Europe in NATO (Eisenhower) . . . 163

Asia

- CHINA: Armistice Negotiations in Korea . . . 188

JAPAN:

- President Names Delegates To Conclude Peace, Security Treaties . . . 187
 U.S. Invites 50 Nations To Sign Peace Treaty . . . 186
 JORDAN: U.S. Sends Condolences on Death of King . . . 171

KOREA:

- Armistice Negotiations . . . 188
 Atrocity Charges Called Propaganda To Discredit U.N. Action . . . 189
 U.S. Policy Toward Middle East . . . 174

Atomic Energy

- Commission Enlarges its Radioisotope Export Program . . . 181

Australia

- President Names Delegates To Conclude Peace, Security Treaties . . . 187

Communism

- Collective Security in the United Nations (Gross) . . . 183
 GERMANY: Touring the Border (Caldwell, HICOG) . . . 166

Congress

- Asked for Measures on Illegal Entry of Migrant Workers . . . 197

Europe**FRANCE:**

- Ninth World Poultry Congress To Meet (Aug. 2-9, 1951) . . . 195
 Rights of American Nationals in Morocco . . . 179
 U.S. Views Administration of Cameroons . . . 190

GERMANY:

- Bavarian Radio To Broadcast on New Frequency . . . 171
 Touring the Border (Caldwell, HICOG) . . . 166
 U.S. Demands That Polish Repatriation Mission Leave, Text . . . 172
 NATO: A Bond for World Freedom (Eisenhower) . . . 163

SPAIN:

- Credits Received for Purchase of Coal, Wheat (Export-Import Bank) . . . 170
 Role in European Defense Statement (Acheson) . . . 170

- SWEDEN: U.S. Concessions Under GATT Effective . . . 169

- SWITZERLAND: UNESCO, IBE Sponsor Convention on Public Education . . . 195

- U.K.: Offers Aid to Flood Victims . . . 165

Finance

- Export-Import Bank Grants Credits to Spain . . . 170

Health

- More Radioisotopes Exported for Use in Medical Research . . . 181

International Meetings

- International Materials Conference . . . 192
 Morris Designated Representative on Criminal Court . . . 194

U.S. Delegations:

- Entry of Mexican Migratory Labor to U.S. . . . 199
 International Conference on Public Education . . . 195
 Poultry Congress To Meet in Paris (Aug. 2-9, 1951) . . . 195
 UNESCO To Hold History Teaching Seminar at Sèvres . . . 196

Labor

- Mexican Labor Importation Being Negotiated . . . 199
 Mexican Migrant Worker Illegal Entry Problem Discussed . . . 197

Mutual Aid and Defense

- NATO: Spain's Role in European Defense (Acheson) . . . 170
 U.S. Policy Toward Middle East . . . 174
 Western Powers Strengthened by Deputies Meeting (Jessup) . . . 187

New Zealand

- President Names Delegates To Conclude Peace, Security Treaties . . . 187

Presidential Documents

- CORRESPONDENCE: Message to Prince Talal on Death of King of Jordan . . . 171
 MESSAGES TO CONGRESS: Approval of Recruitment of Migrant Workers From Mexico . . . 197

Refugees and Displaced Persons

- U.S. Demands That Polish Repatriation Mission Leave Germany, Text . . . 172

U.S.S.R.:

- New Publication, "Peace Offensive" . . . 171
 Western Powers Strengthened by Deputies Meeting (Jessup) . . . 187

Telecommunications

- Bavarian Radio To Broadcast on New Frequency . . . 171

Trade

- AEC Enlarges Radioisotope Export Program . . . 181
 GATT: U.S. Concessions to Sweden Effective . . . 169

Treaties and Other International Agreements

- FRANCE: Treaty of Fez of 1912, French Protectorate Over Morocco . . . 179
 JAPAN: U.S. Invites 50 Nations To Sign Peace Treaty . . . 186

United Nations

- Atrocity Charges in Korea Called Propaganda To Discredit Action . . . 189
 Collective Security vs. Communism (Gross) . . . 183

UNESCO:

- History Teaching Seminar To Be Held at Sèvres . . . 196
 Sponsor Convention on Public Education with IBE . . . 195
 U.S. Representative Morris Designated on Criminal Court . . . 194

Name Index

- Acheson, Secretary Dean . . . 170, 171, 188
 Austin, Warren R. . . . 189
 Caldwell, W. J. . . . 166
 Connally, Tom 187
 Dulles, John Foster 187
 Eisenhower, General Dwight D. . . . 163
 Fisher, Adrian S. . . . 179
 Franco, Generalissimo Francisco . . . 170
 Franks, Sir Oliver 165
 Gross, Ernest A. . . . 183
 Jessup, Philip C. . . . 187
 Lie, Secretary-General Trygve . . . 189
 McGhee, George C. . . . 174
 McGrath, Earl J. . . . 195
 Michaelis, John U. . . . 196
 Morris, George Maurice . . . 196
 al-Rifai, Samir Pasha . . . 171
 Sayre, Francis B. . . . 190
 Sherman, Admiral Forrest P. . . . 170
 Stone, Shepard 171
 Talal, Prince 171
 Truman, President Harry S. . . . 169, 171, 187
 Winton, Berley 195